

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1897.

KEATS'S ODE TO A NIGHTINGALE.

THIS paper enters a protest against that method of criticism whose genius is active to find more faults than virtues in a masterpiece of poetic art. The method is judicial, and errs nine times out of ten if not oftener. *Nil admirari* is the motto, though the other extreme of overpraise is sometimes reached; for the whole matter of the method is a question of taste, and "there is no disputing about taste."

Poe was fond of quoting that Boccacini relates that Zoilus presented Apollo with a very caustic review of an excellent poem. The god asked to be shown the beauties of the work; the critic's answer was that he troubled himself only about the errors. Thereupon the god gave him a sack of unwinnowed wheat and bade him pick out all the chaff for his pains. Who challenges the wisdom of this hint? May the writer of this article

"—better reckon the rede,
Than ever did th' adviser."

In his *Life of Keats*, W. M. Rossetti, at p. 199, quotes Mr. Swinburne on Keats as an artist as follows:

"The faultless force and profound subtlety of this deep and cunning instinct for the absolute natural beauty is doubtless the one main distinctive gift or power which denotes him as a poet among all his equals."

To this Rossetti demurs as too strong praise, and proceeds to sustain his objections by some adverse criticism of the *Ode to a Nightingale*. As against this in spirit is submitted the following study of the same ode, exemplifying a method that takes the poem at its own value.

Given a work of art, a poem, it is plain justice to poet and reader that the interpreter be sympathetic, taking the mind and mood of the artist. What Mrs. Browning says about reading books is apt just here:

"We get no good
By being ungenerous, even to a book,
• • • • • It is rather when
We gloriously forget ourselves, and plunge
Soul-forward, headlong, into a book's profound,

Impassioned for its beauty and salt of truth,—
'Tis then we get the right good from a book."

To gloriously forget ourselves is to be rid of the Baconian *idola*, those distorting influences that stand in our way to truth. Only in this complete self-surrender can the interpreter drink deep, with his readers,

"Of the wine that's meant for souls."

Does not the charm of a work of Art reside in the *undefined*, and indefinable, feeling of delight it begets? Then there is risk in applying the method for exact knowledge to its interpretation. Poe felt this, saying in his Sonnet to *Science*.

"Why preyest thou thus upon the poet's heart,
Vulture, whose wings are dull realities?"

A true poem has within itself, part and parcel, its own excuse for being, and is not measurable by anything without itself. The question is one of *unity, harmony, and completeness*; is one of self-consistency, and that not of *thought* so much as of *feeling*. This is especially true in the case of Keats who takes his stand extremely far from "the heresy of the Didactic." Beauty is his theme, and

"Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all
Ye know on earth and all ye need to know."

However dogmatic and questionable this statement may appear, it calls to mind that Browning, in *Fra Lippo Lippi*, says,

"If you get simple beauty and naught else,
You get about the best thing God invents."

The poem is framed in a dream,—'a waking dream.' There is a losing of himself to the nightingale as she 'Sings of summer in full-throated ease,' and a recalling of himself to his 'sole self' when the 'plaintive anthem' fades away into 'the next valley-glades.'

One can imagine the situation just before the poet breaks out with 'My heart aches!' he is pensive, sad, alone with his own morbid thoughts at night,

"And the mute Silence hist along,
Lest Philomel will deign a song,
In her sweetest saddest plight,
Smoothing the rugged brow of night."

All at once there burst upon his ear, full-throated summer, from his 'spirit's sister, the lorn nightingale.' The shock to his sleeping

senses awoke him from his oblivion with a painful contrast of feeling, because with a sweet tormenting invitation to that music's (at first blush) inaccessible home.

'A drowsy numbness' aptly tells the lethargy of the senses at the sudden perception of an unexpected and keen delight. The dull body limps so far behind the nimble soul! It is painful; it is a sort of 'nightmare Life-in-Death' sensation that is occasioned.

How many times do you suppose Keats had taken some 'dull opiate' to sink 'Lethe-wards' from physical pain? Most naturally this is the source of the figure by which he would express the effect of being too happy in the happiness of the 'light-winged Dryad of the trees.'

['Light-winged Dryad'? Milton says 'blind Fury,' and mingles Classical, Celtic, and Biblical imagery! A glance at a Classical Dictionary will reveal the myth-transforming prerogative of the old poets. Ought the Moderns to know better?]

With the longing to be with the sweet-voiced bird 'in some melodious plot of beechen green,' comes the dull brain to perplex and retard. What is to be done to overcome this, in order to attain to that? The simile of draining the opiate gives the cue to 'O, for a draught of vintage!' in the second stanza.

A draught of what? Not of hemlock that makes 'drowsy,' but of wine—of old wine!—

'Cool'd a long age in the deep-delved earth,'
that gives life and health. It must taste of flowers, dance, song, and mirth. What rich connotation there is in 'tasting of Flora,' 'country green,' 'dance,' 'Provençal song,' 'sunburnt mirth!'

Observe the climactic effect in passing from the more general

'O, for a draught of vintage!'
to the more specific

'O, for a beaker full of the warm South,
Full of the true, the blushful Hippocrene,
With beaded bubbles winking at the brim,
And purple-stained mouth.'

This is wine for souls, reminding us of Elizabeth Barrett's draughts with the blind old Hugh Stuart Boyd, in which she found

'—touches of things common
Till they rose to touch the spheres.'

Not a draught for the senses, but a draught for the soul! Not a draught to benumb, but a draught to inspire!

As feeling is the principal thing in the poem, let us go back to find its rise and to trace, abstractedly from its associated ideas, its course thus far. Conceive the mind-state, the feeling suggested by 'heart aches,' 'drowsy numbness,' 'Lethe-wards.' We might mark this state *despair*. The next, given as the logical cause of the first, may, for the reader, be designated *the happiness of hope*, which is implied in not envying the bird her happy lot, yet being excessively happy in her happiness.

The third stage is where 'the happiness of hope' has grown into *the hope of happiness*, since a means to that end is found. Note the eagerness of hope in 'O, for a draught of vintage!' Observe the almost thirsting impatience of 'O, for a beaker full of the warm South.' From the 'dull opiate' to the 'blushful Hippocrene!' The connection of thought also is close enough to make one feel the organic relation of the parts.

For instance, the first draught is for oblivion of physical pain, the second is for surcease of worldly sorrows. In the one, he sinks Lethe-wards from self, in the other, fades away from men into the dim forest. See how the expression 'Lethe-wards had sunk' is refined into that of 'fade far away, dissolve.'

Close as is the connection of thought between the first and the second draught, there is a progression of thought in the second that makes way for the further evolution of the poem. He is to fade away with the nightingale into the dim forest, and quite forget with her, among the leaves, a certain class of facts; namely, the fever, and fretting, and groaning, and palsied age, and spectre-thin dying youth; he is to quit the place

"Where but to think is to be full of sorrow
And leaden-eyed despairs,
Where Beauty cannot keep her lustrous eyes,
Or new Love pine at them beyond to-morrow."

He is, however, not to forget them by dint of mere dissociation from them, but by a participation in the delights of the new realm.

The third stanza, enumerating so vividly the things he would forget, furnishes thereby the motive for the fourth which opens with 'Away!'

away!' as if terror inspired him to escape to the bird. Recur now to take account of the progress of the feeling. The second stanza reveals the thirst and the smacking of one's lips and the reaching out, so to conceive it, for a beaker full of wine,—to drown what? Before the cup is put to his lips, the direful catalogue of ills for which it is to be nepenthe, burns before his brain. 'The hope of happiness,' is thus desperately intensified; the fruition must not, cannot, longer be deferred! He would now 'fly' to the leafy covert,

Not charioted by Bacchus and his pards,
that were too slow!

If he would fly, he must take wings.

As the draught of the second stanza is rather of poetry than wine, so in perfect consonance, when he must take wings, they are 'the viewless wings of Poesy.' There is no waiting, but, despite the 'dull brain,' a 'scorner of the ground,' he becomes, for the passage, a bird, and exclaims, 'Already with thee!' What an escape! From opiate numbness to blissful ecstasy! Now for fruition!

What follows is a revery within the larger dream. Note the delicateness of 'tender is the night.' What more appropriate expression could be found for the first new feeling in its contrast with the old? The ideal place for revery was suggested in the first stanza in these words:

'In some melodious plot
Of beechen green, and shadows numberless,'

In the fourth stanza it is elaborated with marvelous skill:

'And haply the Queen-Moon is on her throne,
Cluster'd around by all her starry Fays;
But here there is no light,
Save what from heaven is with the breezes blown
Through verdurous glooms and winding mossy ways.'

What is his reason for saying the Queen-Moon is haply on her throne? There is a light from heaven blown in with the breezes through the verdurous glooms.

The expression, 'winding mossy ways,' closing stanza four, is taken up in thought in the first line of the fifth stanza, thus:

'I cannot see what flowers are at my feet.'

The poet is not to be thought of as a bird among the boughs, but as a man treading the mossy paths, at night, of a beechen grove.

He cannot see the flowers below at his feet, 'nor what soft incense hangs upon the boughs' above his head; all is embalmed in darkness. As he walks along he has to guess the sweets, of the grass, 'the thicket,' 'the fruit-tree wild,' 'the fading violets,' 'the coming musk-rose full of dewy wine.' What an intoxication of sweets! Embalmed in darkness and in sweets! Only two senses alert, the one for odors, and that for sounds.

Stanza five is given to the first, and the sixth stanza takes up, naturally and with added effect, the second. See how aptly it begins: 'Darkling I listen.' The suggestion is that he pauses to listen; he has just been walking along through this haunt of sweets. The pause is onomatopoeically indicated in the word 'listen,' magnified by the semicolon following. The conjunction 'and,' continuing the first line, is natural, and grammatically connected with the fifth line, thus,

*and—

Now more than ever seems it rich to die.'

The parenthesis of musing left out, is

'For many a time
I have been half in love with easeful Death,
Call'd him soft names in a mused rhyme,
To take into the air my quiet breath.'

Conceive the situation, then enjoy the climax of feeling in these lines:

'Now more than ever seems it rich to die,
To cease upon the midnight with no pain,
While thou art pouring forth thy soul abroad
In such ecstasy!'

Consider how closely connected the last two lines of this stanza are with those quoted. If he ceased upon the midnight, *while* the bird was pouring forth her soul—the song continuing is the idea—he would 'have ears in vain.' Her song would be appropriately a requiem to him 'become a sod.'

This last expression has been severely criticised, but the connection of thought between it and what goes before and what follows immediately in stanza seven, is intimate enough to require 'sod' for the harmony of thought. He has been treading mossy ways; he was not able to see the flowers at his feet; he has to guess the sweet of the grass: all this is suggestive of 'sod.' In the seventh stanza, the second line,

'No hungry generations tread thee down,'
grows out of the idea of treading sod down,—
treading him, become a sod, down. He had
been treading sod down. Perhaps the word
'sod' will appear the more fitting from a con-
sideration of the dead-and-buried idea associ-
ated with the mortality of man, and the lack
of such an association with the birds of the
air.

Man dies and a mound of turf is the constant
reminder of his mortality; birds die too, but
what marks their resting-place? Do they die,
or simply 'leave the world unseen,' for a sea-
son? Every returning spring brings them back
with the same fashion of feathers and the
same melody of song. Nothing but a process
of reasoning assures us that they die, but, to
our senses, the exact reproduction of types
argues their immortality.

On the other hand, to our senses, man is
mortal, and only to our reason, immortal.
Keats, taking the poetic view of things and
not the scientific (Stedman's *Victorian Poets*,
p. 9), says to the nightingale.

'Thou wast not born for death, immortal Bird!'

His reason therefore is, that this self-same song
was heard in olden-times by emperor and
clown, that it found its way, perhaps, to Ruth's
sad heart, as homesick 'she stood in tears
amid the alien corn,' and

'The same that oft-times hath
Charm'd magic casements, opening on the foam
Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.'

So much for the immortality of the nightin-
gale.

He says in the last stanza:

'Adieu! adieu! thy plaintive anthem fades
Past the near meadows, over the still stream,
Up the hill-side; and now 'tis buried deep
In the next valley-glades.'

He is 'forlorn;' that word is like a bell to toll
him back to himself and back to the world of
sorrows.

How significant the word is, taken in con-
nection with all that has been said and sug-
gested about 'easeful Death!'

Forlorn? yes, for it is but 'a waking dream.'

It is a sad experience that, sometimes,

'the fancy cannot cheat so well
As she is fam'd to do, deceiving elf.'

And here at the end we have the same tone of

feeling as in the beginning.

It was the nightingale's full-throated music
that made his heart ache; 'fled is that music,'
he is forlorn.

In conclusion, the poem is a circle; it is a
whole whose parts are fitly joined together;
joined together?—there are no seams, nothing
artisan about it; out of the fire of the creative
imagination it comes 'a thing of beauty;' it is
an artistic whole showing the *unity, harmony,*
and *completeness*, of interrelated parts, by
virtue of which the reader experiences the
pleasurable sense of the Beautiful.

JOHN P. FRUIT.

Bethel College.

A STUDY IN THE CLASSIC FRENCH DRAMA: CORNEILLE.

THE Miracle Plays and Mysteries of the Mid-
dle Ages delighted Europe for more than two
centuries, but in Italy, Spain, and England,
they were discarded earlier than in France for
works of greater merit and somewhat more
regular in their composition. The Italians
began to translate the ancients, especially
Seneca, and a national drama arose in Spain
with Lope de Vega, and in England with
Shakespeare. In France the development of
the drama was not as rapid, and it was only in
1548 that the Parliament of Paris forbade the
representation of the Mysteries. The religious
plays continued under different names, but
the whole conception of the serious drama
changed. The Mysteries had had for object
the representation of events of great interest
to the audience, at that time, and extending
over many years. No attention was paid to
the unities of time, of place, and of action, and
there was no division into acts and scenes.

In the sixteenth century the works of the
ancients began to be translated, and in 1552
Jodelle wrote his *Cléopâtre*, where are seen the
principal traits which were to characterize
later the Classic French tragedy. Garnier and
Montchrestien followed in the sixteenth cen-
tury, then Hardy and Mairet in the seventeenth,
but in spite of great freedom left the dramatic
writers, there was for a long time in France no
Lope de Vega, no Shakespeare.

"Enfin Corneille vint," and the *Cid* appeared

in 1636. The author of that wonderful tragedy had already written several comedies, and *Médée*, a tragedy. He had even collaborated with Richelieu himself, whom he had displeased by not following slavishly the plans of tragedies prepared by the great minister. Nothing, however, could have led any one to foresee that Corneille was able to produce the *Cid*, and when that tragedy was played it excited boundless enthusiasm by the chivalric spirit of the heroes and the beauty of the verse. France could then mention her poet and be proud of her Corneille as England was of her Shakespeare. There is no doubt that the English dramatist is superior to the French. Shakespeare is universal and studies all the classes of society and all the passions and feelings of men. His works are, at the same time, interesting for the plot, which is often complicated, and for the delineation of character, and his depth of thought is as wonderful as his knowledge of the human heart. Corneille's works are not as varied nor as profound as those of Shakespeare, and although a writer of comedies as well as of tragedies, there is not in any one work of his both the comic and the tragic, which often produce such a pleasing effect in Shakespeare. The difference in the plays of the two poets lies not only in the difference of their genius but principally in the French conception of comedy and tragedy.

In the Miracle Plays and Mysteries of the Middle Ages we see the blending together of the comic and the serious, of the religious and the profane, and Hugo's Romantic school invented nothing when they advocated the mixture of comedy and tragedy in the same play. In the Classic French drama, however, which begins with the Renaissance in the sixteenth century, the line was strictly drawn between comedy and tragedy. In the former there was to be nothing essentially tragic, although Molière often went in his masterpieces to the very verge of the serious. In tragedy there was to be nothing comic. Again, the Classic French drama was a psychological study, and no complicated plot was required for the development of a passion, of a feeling. Provided that passion, that feeling was deep, it was sufficient to be a subject for a tragedy. There

was no necessity that the play should end with the death of nearly all the personages on the stage, as in most of Shakespeare's tragedies. The play often ended by a marriage, but that fortunate result must have been brought about by events which called for an emotion sufficiently deep for the study of character.

I wish to call attention once more to that chief purpose of the Classic French drama and to repeat again that it is nothing but a psychological study. A number of critics have not understood this essential characteristic and, therefore, have not understood French tragedy. How easy it has seemed to Schlegel and others to ridicule the rules of the unities, that of place, which required the action to happen in the same hall of the same palace; that of time, which allowed to the event only twenty-four hours; that of action, which required one main plot and the concentration of the interest on the same personages. The unity of action alone was pardoned by the critics referred to, and they comment at great length on the unreality, on the artificiality of the rules of the unities. Of course it would be absurd to imagine the events in *Othello* and *Hamlet* restricted to one place and to one day, for Shakespeare intended, by a complicated plot, to describe not only one passion, but in the same play to make us see in different persons, different passions. In *Othello* we have the devoted love of Desdemona, the hatred and hypocrisy of Iago, and the fierce jealousy of Othello, whilst in *Hamlet* nearly all the problems which agitate the human soul are studied in a masterly manner.

According to the French conception of tragedy, the event leading to the catastrophe could take place in one palace and in twenty-four hours, because, being given men and women with a profound passion, the development of that passion did not call for many events in different places or for a long duration of time. By the representation of a tragedy necessitating two or three hours, the French dramatists imagined that they were coming nearer the appearance of truth in allowing only twenty-four hours to the action, than did the English and Spanish dramatists with their action extending often over several years. There can be no true representation of life on the stage; every-

thing is more or less conventional, and whatever in the Classic French drama was lost in the interest of the plot, was gained in conciseness and force. The necessity of concentrating the event into a limited space of time and into one place called for the deepest thought and made the tragedies of Corneille and Racine wonderfully concise and strong. Let us not, therefore, regret that the Classic French tragedy obeyed the rules of the unities, for we probably owe to these rules the chief charm of the masterpieces of the seventeenth century. It is true that it required men of genius to produce great works, according to this conception of the drama, from the second half of the sixteenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century, and I admit that these men were rare, but let us be satisfied with the *Cid* and *Polyeucte*, with *Andromaque*, *Britannicus*, *Phèdre*, and *Athalie*, and even with *Zaïre*, *Mérope*, and *Tancrède*.

As critics we study the plans and purposes of the great dramatists, but as men possessed with the sense of what is beautiful and noble, we care not whether Corneille and Racine even thought of the rules of the unities or intended to study love or hatred. We are simply entranced by the sublimity, by the sweetness, by the exquisite charm of their works. We are deeply interested in the love of Rodrigue and Chimène, we are roused to enthusiasm by the lofty patriotism of the old Horatius, by the admirable clemency of Augustus, and the immutable Christian faith of Polyeucte.

In reading Corneille we see that the poet's aim is grandeur, and his heroes are said to have been greater than ordinary mortals. It is a shame for humanity if there are not to be found men and women animated by the noble feelings of Corneille's heroes and heroines. In the struggle between love and duty, which of the two should triumph? Let every man answer that question for himself, but let him read Corneille and take lessons in self-sacrifice, in everything inspiring. There are to be found in that poet's works the grandest maxims of morality and of patriotism expressed with a lofty eloquence. Corneille's chief qualities are sublimity in the thought and eloquence in the expression. His defects are those of his age,

some bombastic and affected discourses, but his qualities are those that we may expect from a noble and pure soul. His life was simple and uneventful, and we must look for his grand genius in only a few of his works—in his greatest, the *Cid*, *Horace*, *Cinna*, and *Polyeucte*, and to some extent also in *Rodogune*, *Nicomède*, *Pompée*, *Héraclius*, and *Don Sanche*. In his other tragedies his thought is often sublime, but the expression no longer corresponds with it, and in the midst of beautiful ideas and often beautiful verses we meet with passages which are somewhat ludicrous in their pomposity.

To fully appreciate Corneille we must remember that, long before Molière produced his great works, Corneille wrote the *Menteur*, an excellent comedy. To compare him with Shakespeare we must, therefore, study his comedies as well as his tragedies, and we shall admire in the *Menteur* most delicate wit and charming situations. In the *Cid* the rules of the unities are not strictly observed, but how much stronger and more pathetic is Corneille's work than that of Guillem de Castro! The *Cid* is endowed with perpetual youth, and a thrill of emotion passes through our being on reading that ever charming "duet of love" between Chimène and Rodrigue. *Horace*, *Cinna*, and *Polyeucte* are grand and sublime, and in studying literature, even after having read Shakespeare, Schiller, and Goethe, we shall ever exclaim with Mme de Sévigné: *Vive notre vieux Corneille!*

ALCÉE FORTIER.

Tulane University.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *Overwhelm*.

THE word *whelm* or *overwhelm* has not been traced farther back than Middle English. Skeat¹ says:

"The word presents some difficulty; but it is obvious that *whelm* and *overwhelm* must be closely related to M.E. *whelven* and *overwhelven*, which are used in almost precisely the same sense."

He then assumes a substantive *whelm* as the base of the verb. He does not say what meaning he supposes this to have had, but

¹ The Century dictionary, besides copying Skeat's etymology, modestly suggests that *whelm* may be *whelve* influenced by *welm* 'to bubble.'

compares O. Swedish *hwalma* 'to cock hay' from *hwaln* 'hay-cock,' and then follows Ihre in tracing *hwaln* to the root shown in O.N. *hwelva*, M.E. *hwelven*, German *wölben*, and adds,

"Thus the original sense of [the verb] *whelm* was to arch over, vault, make of a convex form; hence, to turn a hollow dish over, which would then present such a form; hence, to upset, overturn, which is now the prevailing idea."

That is, he implies that O. Swedish *hwaln* and the verb derived from it, *hwalma*, originally had the same meaning as the more original *hwalf* 'arch, vault' and its verb, and only afterward got the meanings 'hay-cock' and 'to cock hay;' and that when we reconstruct an O.E. *hwelm* as a sort of cognate to O. Swedish *hwaln*, we may give the word the meaning that he supposes the O. Swedish word originally had. As, however, O. Swedish *hwalf* and its verb persisted and retained the meanings 'arch, vault' and 'to arch, vault, turn, cover,' etc., it is rather a bold thing for us to assume that occasion arose for a derivative noun and verb in the same sense, which, however, soon changed to another meaning, while the earlier forms persisted and retained the original meaning unimpaired. Furthermore, he implies that his supposed O.E. **hwelm* did not remain in use and changed its meaning to 'hay-cock' as the O. Swedish word did, but, having given birth to the verb *hwelmen* with the same meaning as the earlier *hwelven*, it perished and was never recorded.

One who was not supporting a theory would think it but natural that the O. Swedish derivative *hwaln* from the start meant something different from, though similar to, a *hwalf*, probably just what we find it means, 'hay-cock,' and that its verb never meant anything but 'cock hay.' And so, if we suppose there was occasion to form an O.E. derivative substantive **hwelm*, we must suppose it expressed an idea different from, but similar to, the earlier *hwealf* and that this was probably the same idea as the O. Swedish *hwaln* had; furthermore, that, if *hwelmen* was derived from **hwelm*, it meant 'cock hay' as its supposed O. Swedish cognate did, and did not express the same idea that had all along been expressed by the almost identical *hwelven*. But

how we should get from 'cock hay' to 'roll, turn, cover,' it would be difficult to conjecture. It is, however, not necessary to trouble ourselves about a supposed O.E. **hwelm* and its meaning and the connection of that meaning with the meaning of M.E. *hwelmen*. Skeat was right in suspecting a connection between M.E. *overwhelmen* and *overhwelven*, but he went out of his way when, on the basis of the O. Swedish word for 'hay-cock,' he reconstructed as the connecting link an O.E. substantive with another meaning.

In Old English there were two words of similar form and signification:—

1. (*be*)*hwylfan* 'cover,' M.E. *hwelven*, *overwhelven* 'roll, turn, cover,' O.N. *hwelfa*, German *wölben*, etc.;

2. *helmian*, *oferhelmian* 'cover, extend over,'

These two words early die out, *hwelven* apparently holding out the longer of the two, but another appears of similar form and the same meaning. It is:—

3. M.E. *hwelmen*, *overwhelmen* 'roll, turn, cover.' That (*over*)*hwelmen* is a contamination of the two words it displaces—

overhwelv- } *overwhelm-*

is too self-evident to need argument. Compare M.H.G.

vernüegen } *vergnüegen*.

genüegen }

Similar contaminations (mostly of my own making) that have recently come under my observation are:—

elevated speech } *elegated*.

elegant " }

undertake } *undertempt*.

attempt }

mistrust } *mispect*.

suspect }

inverted } *inversed*.

reversed }

complain } *compline*.

whine }

faults } *fallings*.

failings }

'Socrates had his fallings'—President Hall, observed by Dr. Lukens. I have said 'to put you in such a 'bix' from *box* and *fix*. At one time I said 'pook,' at another 'pill,' both from *pull* and *pick*. I have also said 'cat' for *cap* or *hat*.

Similar contaminations may be heard every

day.² In order, however, that one of them become established it is necessary that it occur frequently, that is, that the temptation to make it be very strong—that not only the meaning of the two originals be practically the same, but that the form, too, be very similar. It would hardly be possible for these conditions to be better met, in words of different origin, than in *overhuelve* and *overhelm*; they are surely better met than in M.H.G. *ûche* 'toad,' *unc* 'snake' > *unke* 'toad' or 'snake.' It is also necessary that the form that the contamination assumes should not coincide with a word already in use; hence, while 'cat' may frequently arise out of *cap* and *hat*, it has no chance of persisting as a name for a covering for the head.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

A MANUSCRIPT OF THE GOUVERNEMENT DES ROIS.

READERS of the MOD. LANG. NOTES, and especially Romance scholars, will be interested to know that a valuable Old-French MS., assigned to the first half of the fourteenth century, is now in this country. It was purchased of Quaritch, in London, by Mr. John E. Kerr, Jr., of New York City, a gentleman deeply interested in Romance studies and a valued contributor to the NOTES, though not a scholar by profession, and is one of the unique volumes in his remarkable Romance library. The MS. contains a complete copy and excellent text of Henry de Ganchi's unpublished French version of Egidio Colonna's famous treatise on the education of princes: 'De Regimine Principum Libri Tres,' which was written for his royal pupil Philip, son of King Philip III. of France, hence prior to 1285. Egidio and his numerous writings form the subject of an article of nearly one hundred and fifty pages, by Félix Lajard in a recent volume (xxx) of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, and is thus brought once more nearer to the modern student.

The Kerr MS. is a large folio volume of one hundred and six leaves; the writing—à doubles

² Paul's *Principien*, p. 132 ff.; Weringer: *Versprechen und Verlesen*, p. 58 ff.

colonnes—is clear and uniform throughout. The recto of the first leaf presents in a handsomely illuminated initial the king, with crown and sceptre, on his throne; standing before him is a man in black cowl, with tonsured head, who holds a volume in his left hand, the right being raised as if for exhortation; numerous grotesque figures adorn the margins.—Below are given *incipit* and *explicit*.

Incipit: A son espetial seigneur né de lignie roial et sainte, mon seigneur Phelippe, ainz né fiz et oir mon seigneur Phelippe tres noble roi de France par la Grace de deu, frere Gile de Romme, son clerc humble et devot, frere de l'ordre de saint Augustin, salut et quanqu'il puet de servise et de honneur. Le livre de gouvernier les cités que l'en apele politique nos enseigne que toutes seignories ne durent pas tant l'une comme l'autre.

Explicit: Ci fine li livres du gouvernement des rois et des princes que frere Gires de Romme de l'ordre de saint Augustin a fet. Lequel livre mestre Henry de Ganchi par le commandement le noble roi Phelipe de France a translaté de latin en franceis.

Throughout the work marginal glosses in French, English, and Latin are found.

Through the kindness of Mr. Kerr, this manuscript was made the basis of a seminary course in the Romance Department of Columbia University. Later a complete transcription of the MS. was made by the undersigned, preparatory to an edition with notes which, it is hoped, will be published in the near future.

S. P. MOLENAER.

Morristown, N. J.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The Literary History of the American Revolution. By MOSES COIT TYLER. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York and London: 1897, Vol. I.

PROFESSOR TYLER is already well known to historical and literary students in his able work *A History of American Literature during the Colonial Time*, the history covering the period from 1607 to 1765. The book before us is the first of two volumes,¹ and takes up the record where Vol. II of the former work left it, embracing the years 1763-1776, the second volume to close in 1783.

The author, in his Preface, calls the book

¹ The second volume is now published.

"the product of a new method in the critical treatment of the American Revolution." By this he means that the "inward history" of the Revolution, as distinct from its outward, will be given—"the history of its ideas, its spiritual moods, its motives and passions."

The author emphasizes the fact that he allows the two great parties of the time, the Whigs and the Tories, to express their respective views with the utmost freedom and impartiality. He is also very careful to state, in accordance with the title of his book, that the literary elements shall dominate all others; that the "writers" of the Revolution shall be conspicuous above generals and statesmen, and ideas and moral forces be seen to control all else in the gradual evolution of the final result.

Still further, he insists that the American People shall be prominent, as they wrought and fought in those troublous days, while throughout the history the author aims to minimize the differences between England and America, to magnify all elements of common interest, and so to prepare the way for the "promotion of a better understanding, of a deeper respect and a kindlier mood, among their respective descendants." The book is thus designed to be along the lines of Higher Criticism in the department of Literary History, both as to the character of its subject-matter and the catholic temper that pervades it.

Of the twenty-three chapters making up the Table of Contents, there is a sense in which the first is the most typical as embracing, in condensed form, the general purpose and spirit of the volume. Its title—"Literary Aspects of The Period of The Revolution," is almost identical with that of the book itself. In this initial chapter, the author notices the fact that the literature was argumentative and combative, the expression of thought and emotion profoundly stirred, and dwells with special emphasis on the various classes of prose and verse which were the product of the period. These he describes as Letters, especially those of Franklin, John Adams and Mrs. Adams and Washington; State Papers; Oral Addresses; Political Essays, in the form of Pamphlets; Political Satires, in verse; Lyr-

ic Poetry; Burlesques and Parodies; Dramatic Compositions and Narratives of Experience. These various orders of prose and poetry, as he contends, expressed above all the social life of the Revolution and the inner character of the people, making the interest of the era humanistic throughout, and compelling the historian of the epoch to magnify the mental and spiritual forces that were operative above all material agencies. Whatever the artistic character of the product may be, the literature, as the author contends, derives its value from the fact that it is "a perfectly sincere revelation of themselves on the part of a high-spirited people in a supreme crisis of their development."

In Chapter Second, the historian deals with what he aptly calls, "The Prelude of Political Debate," laying special stress on the services rendered by James Otis, as he argued so ably and successfully against Writs of Assistance. It was, as he tells us, in the Old Town House in Boston, in 1761, in this great legal debate, that we behold "the first scene of the first act of opposition to the arbitrary claims of Great Britain." In similar manner, in the following chapter, he reviews the history of the Stamp Act and the relation of Otis and Hopkins thereto, as defenders of the rights of the colonies, while in Chapter Fourth, Otis is still the conspicuous figure in debate as he replies to a famous pamphleteer of the time, in his defence of the taxation of the colonies. In all these discussions, Professor Tyler is careful to note the high literary quality of Otis' work; that he was a classically cultured man; that his various papers were direct contributions to the best authorship of the Revolution, and that as a leader of political opinion at the time, he was, also, in every true sense, a man of letters.

So, in Chapter Fifth, in a further discussion of The Stamp Act, he significantly dwells on "the literary responses" evoked by its passage, giving to the utterances of John Adams the place of prominence. In writing of Jonathan Mayhew, whom he calls "An Early Pulpit-Champion of Colonial Rights," he is careful to note his ability as a writer, reflecting in his style and spirit the virile qualities of John Milton, in the days of The Commonwealth. As Tyler states it, "he had an eye for the

strategic uses of the printing-press as an ally to the pulpit" and never failed to utter burning words against all forms of despotism in church and state. In Chapter Seventh, when treating of those authors who gave "Descriptions of Nature and Man in the American Wilderness," of Carver and Rogers and Adair, he is at great pains to show, in every separate instance, that these narratives were not only histories but specimens of literature, of no inferior order. In Chapters Eight and Nine, the literature of the Colonist is the exclusive type—"Beginnings of New Life in Verse and Prose," as seen, respectively, in *The Middle States* and *New England*, in the writings of Francis Hopkinson, Philip Freneau, who graduated at Princeton in 1771, and John Trumbull, an alumnus of Yale, 1767, poet and prose writer, and as far back as 1770, pleading for the presence of æstheticism in literature.

In Chapter Ten, attention is called to the new awakening in political writing occasioned by the repeal of the Stamp Act in 1766, the most notable of these writings being from the pen of John Dickinson, under the title *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania to the Inhabitants of The British Colonies*. Professor Tyler goes so far as to say that their appearance constituted "the most brilliant event in the literary history of the Revolution," the deliverances of a strong-minded and discreet thinker on pending problems, anxious to secure the rights of all concerned and yet thoroughly loyal to the best interests of the Colonies.

Next follows the famous Tea Controversy, interesting as eliciting utterances from "Junius" and Edmund Burke, and emphasized by the author because of the various writings in prose and verse which it evoked. Francis Hopkinson's *Pretty Story or The Old Farm and The New Farm: A Political Allegory*, is a fine example of early colonial fiction, the "Old Farm" representing England, and the "New Farm," the American Colonies. It is an allegorical account of the reasons for the assembling of The Continental Congress, 1774, the "Story" ending as the Congress convenes. In the following chapters (13-17), the author discusses The Loyalists and their Literature, such literature being especially occasioned by the convening of the First Continental Con-

gress. The estimate placed by Professor Tyler on these Sons of the Revolution is significant. He speaks of them as "refined, thoughtful and conscientious," the "representatives of conservatism;" notes that a goodly number of them were college men, graduates of Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Pennsylvania, in point of numbers far from inconsiderable, and in point of character, far from despicable." He dwells with interest on the Loyalist Sermon Writers, especially on the discourses of Jonathan Boucher, and then devotes several chapters to the pointed protests of the loyalists against the measures of the first congress. The celebrated authors of these protests, Samuel Seabury, Daniel Leonard and Joseph Galloway, are fully and graphically described by the author, his main purpose here, as elsewhere, being to show what was the literary quality of these Protests and just how they aided the developing authorship of the time. The chief answers to these Protests on the part of the Whigs are especially memorable as coming from the pens of Alexander Hamilton and John Adams, and were marked alike for their intellectual vigor and their high literary style.

In Chapter Nineteen, Professor Tyler takes up the interesting topic—"The Entrance of Satire into the Revolutionary Controversy," such a form of literature being naturally induced by the beginning of actual conflict, the substitution of force for argument, Philip Freneau and John Trumbull re-appearing as political authors and satirists, in such productions as *The Midnight Consultations* and *McFingal*.

The arrival of Thomas Paine from England, in 1774, and the publication, in 1776, of his *Common Sense*, mark an epoch in the revolutionary history second to none in importance. Then follows what the author calls "The Popular Debate over the Purpose for Independence," and the volume aptly closes with an account of "Thomas Jefferson and The Great Declaration," noticing Jefferson's special gifts as a statesman and writer; his drafting of the Declaration; criticisms, pro and con of the document by English and American publicists; its profound influence on American Institutions and the politics and ethics of Christendom, and last of all, and most especially, its supreme literary merit,

"the most commanding and the most pathetic utterance, in any age, in any language, of national grievances and of national purposes, —a stately and passionate chant of human freedom, a pure lyric of civil and military heroism."

It is clear from such a rapid survey of the contents and scope of the volume before us that it is the work of an accurate and a comprehensive mind, thoroughly alive to the vast interests involved in the narrative and wholly intent upon giving a just account of our colonial days. The author's promise in the Preface has been fully realized, in giving us the "inward history" of the Revolution, in allowing the Whigs and the Tories "to tell their own story freely in their own way;" in giving us an "acquaintance with the American People themselves;" above all, in giving us the "literary history of the Revolution" as it has never before been given.

As already suggested, the volume is constructed and developed on the method of the higher historical criticism, and, as such, commends itself to all historical students who are seeking the causes of external events and the principles that underlie great national movements, while the pervading spirit of the narrative is so high-minded and generous as to dispel all prejudices on the part of the most capacious reader.

Even the introduction of data apparently inferior and commonplace in themselves is justified by the special use the author makes of them, and the way in which he relates them to the most important civic events. As to the historical style of Professor Tyler, American readers need not be told that it is a model of clearness, vitality and literary taste, and thus happily in keeping with the primal purpose of the book as a specifically literary history.

THEODORE W. HUNT.

Princeton University.

CHRESTOMATHIE FRANÇAISE.

Chrestomathie française, by A. RAMBEAU and J. PASSY; Henry Holt & Co., New York: 1897; pp. xxxv+250.

AMONG the many new ways of teaching French that have claimed our attention of late years,

there are two that appear destined to achieve something more than passing notoriety: the phonetic or "reform" method, which owes its success largely to the efforts of Professor Vietor of Marburg and Dr. Paul Passy of Paris, and the "psychological" or Gouin system, improved and brought into general notice by Mr. Bétis. Readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES are doubtless somewhat familiar with both of these schemes. The characteristic feature of the former is its scientific treatment of pronunciation: at the very beginning of the course, the individual sounds are carefully described and practised, and their combinations are made familiar to the pupil by the constant use of graded texts in phonetic spelling; the ordinary orthography is reserved for a later stage, when it is acquired with comparative ease. The chief articles in the "psychological" program are the cultivation of the habit of "visualization" (that is, forming a distinct mental image of a thing or act at the time when the word representing it is learned) and the principle of association of ideas, which leads to the grouping of all the common words (or rather phrases) of the spoken tongue into a limited number of categories. Both plans agree in basing the first instruction on the young, living idiom, leaving the older, literary language for subsequent study; this arrangement is, of course, common to the Sauveur and other "conversational" methods.

The two systems just described seem naturally to supplement each other. The weakest part of the Gouin plan, as far as I can judge, is its handling of pronunciation; while the "reform" method takes but little advantage of the important mnemonic aid afforded by association, and pays no attention to "visualization," relying (to a certain extent) upon concrete objects and pictures, instead of utilizing the child's ever active imagination. I can hardly see, then, at the present moment, how a satisfactory method of teaching our school-children and college students to speak or understand a foreign language can be constructed otherwise than by coupling the ideas of Professor Vietor with those of Mr. Bétis.

In all such discussions, however, it should be remembered that fully nine-tenths of the French pupils in our public schools will never

in their lives have an opportunity to speak French. It is evident that the course intended for these children should be planned with the sole object (except in so far as mental discipline is concerned) of teaching them to read French literature easily and appreciatively. For this end, are the methods now generally used in our best schools inferior to either of the new systems, or to a combination of the two? I am nearly persuaded that they are. The experience of many teachers in other countries seems to show that pupils taught according to the phonetic plan learn to read sooner and better than those instructed in the old way. As to the Gouin system, I had an opportunity last year of seeing the effect of its application in the lowest grade of one of the public high schools of Boston: the class, to be sure, was rather small and of uncommonly good stuff; the teacher, an intelligent young American lady, who had had no unusual advantages, was taking lessons of Mr. Bétis; but making all due allowance for the size and quality of the class and the enthusiasm indirectly inspired by the principal inventor of the method, it must be admitted that the results, at the end of the year, showed a proficiency and accuracy, not merely in speaking French, but in writing and translating it, which almost justifies the belief that the system can profitably be adapted to the resources and purposes of any first-class public school.

The "psychological" method has as yet made but little show in print; a volume by Mr. Bétis, called *The Facts of Life*, is its chief representative. The phonetic movement, on the other hand, has given rise to a voluminous literature, especially in Germany: pedagogical essays are constantly appearing, and textbooks are almost equally numerous. The latter are not all deserving of unqualified praise, but some of them take rank among the best productions of linguistic science; such, for instance, are the works of Sweet, Franz Beyer, Paul Passy and Lenz. The needs of the "reform" teacher are manifold: he requires not only treatises on phonetics, and grammars written from his standpoint, but also, and above all, collections of texts in phonetic transcription. Several volumes of this kind have already appeared, but there has

been, as far as I know, none so extensive or so diversified as the *Chrestomathie française* just prepared by Professor Rambeau of Johns Hopkins and Mr. Jean Passy, a brother of the editor of the *Maître phonétique*.

This work is meant particularly for English-speaking students, but will do almost as well for pupils of any nationality. It is intended, moreover, for persons who have already mastered the rudiments; hence the texts (which comprise both prose and verse, and are chosen to illustrate various phases of French life and thought) are given both in phonetic transcription and, on the opposite pages, in the standard orthography. The volume opens with an earnest plea for the "new method," followed by a very concise statement of the principal facts of French phonetics. The characters employed for sound-spelling are those of the international alphabet of the Association Phonétique. While these symbols are open to several serious objections when used for other languages, they are especially adapted to French; aside from the somewhat disturbing effect of the colon that marks vowel-length, the alphabet serves its present purpose very well, although the mixing of different kinds of type makes it unattractive to the eye. The print is clear and fully as correct as one could reasonably expect in a first edition. The poetry is arranged according to Paul Passy's *Hebung* hypothesis, which defines the line as a fixed number of stressed syllables accompanied (and generally separated) by a more or less indeterminate number of unaccented ones; this theory is interesting, and fits tolerably well a great deal of modern verse, but the scientific public is hardly ready, I think, to accept it without reserve.

It is hardly necessary to say that a book of this sort demands for its preparation an amount of care, patience, and industry such as few of the most difficult scientific works ever require. I trust that French instructors in our country, even if they do not feel able to use the *Chrestomathie* in their classes, will appreciate the abundant opportunity for self-improvement here afforded them, and that an increased interest in phonetics and in systematic and intelligent teaching will convince the authors

that they have not labored in vain.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

IRISH LITERATURE.

The Voyage of Bran Son of Febal to the Land of the Living. An Old Irish Saga now first edited, with Translation, Notes, and Glossary, by KUNO MEYER, with an Essay upon the Irish Vision of the Happy Otherworld and the Celtic Doctrine of Rebirth, by ALFRED NUTT. Section I, The Happy Otherworld, London: David Nutt, 1895 [Vol. iv of the Grimm Library].

THE *Voyage of Bran*, the poem which gives to this volume its name, and Professor Meyer's studies concerning it, appeal especially to the student of Celtic; the completed Part I of Mr. Nutt's essay, restricted also, in a sense, to Celtic ground, has for its purpose a study of the connection of the Happy Otherworld idea, as found in the poem, with that idea in other literatures. Such a study, even though, by necessity, in outline and not exhaustive (p. 228), is of interest and value to every student of comparative literature.

A reader approaching from this standpoint will at once be struck by the comparative unfamiliarity of the material of the Essay. The first four pages (115-118) include references to the 'sons of Mil' and the pre-Milesian period, the 'South Welsh chronicler Nennius,' the 'foundation of Emania,' the 'Amazon Macha,' 'Tigernach,' 'Loegaire Lorc,' 'Labraid Loingsiach,' 'Connaire Mor,' and the 'Togail Bruidne de Derga.' There are hundreds of equally unfamiliar names throughout the Essay. The impossibility of verifying so many statements again and again causes the reader to yield the critical spirit and follow the author wherever he leads. This not only requires the reader to repose much confidence in the author—no great task, indeed, when the latter happens to be Mr. Nutt—but forces both sense of proportion and judgement into abeyance, and makes his mental attitude unsatisfactory in that he must be credulous rather than critical.

On the other hand, much is added to the author's meed of praise when it is seen how

well, in spite of these especial difficulties of material and presentation, he has succeeded in giving this first systematic account of facts of Early Irish literature.

The matter is not, however, entirely strange. The struggle between Christian and anti-Christian literature is found here (p. 227) as elsewhere, events cluster around the somewhat familiar Connaught (p. 123, 209), we here meet again the *Mabinogion* (p. 129), the *Annals of The Four Masters*, and O'Grady's *History of Ireland*. We find hollow hill stories (p. 177) such as Irving made popular in *The Alhambra*, stories of dwellers beneath the sea (p. 181) as found in many literatures. In one place we see that Tennyson has anticipated us in his search for literary material (p. 236), in numerous ways Mr. Joseph Jacobs has preceded, and in very many directions Mr. Whitley Stokes has gone before. Many references of interest and of greater or less importance connect with Adamnan's Vision (pp. 219, 250, 253), and Ailill (pp. 202, 209); with Barlaam and Josaphat (p. 249), and with Brendan (pp. 161, 284, 300), the isle of sheep (p. 202), and the isle of birds (pp. 202 f., 205, 218, 225, 235), singing masses (p. 221), which he visited. There are connections with the Land of Cockayne (pp. 278, 321 f.), the Book of Enoch (pp. 254, 291), the Vision of Fursius (pp. 228, 245 n., 249, 253); with St. Patrick (pp. 152, 197, 218, 228), the Vision of Paul (p. 249), and the Anglo-Saxon Phoenix (pp. 245-248); with Thorkill (pp. 167 n., 172 n., 302), and Tundale (pp. 225, 228).

References to Amazons (p. 117), to food in Paradise which had to every man the flavor of his most favorite dish (pp. 30, 163 f.), to the legends of the Flood (p. 197), and to the Fourth Paradise (p. 203), should, perhaps, be classed among the semi-familiar. References to less known, although important, facts draw attention to a new (to the reader) tradition connected with the British coronation stone (p. 187 n.), to a certain mysterious five-fold crimson mantle (pp. 153, 180), which is mentioned more than once, to a method of preventing persons from ever again meeting, by waving a magic cloak between them (p. 157), to the method of producing sleep, by waving a branch of a certain tree (p. 190). Striking are tales of a cup (p. 191), a bit of common sod (p. 217), and a

boiled pig (p. 217), all of which could tell truth from falsehood.

Incidentally, it is possible to learn the ideals of adventure (p. 195), the ideas of strength and beauty (p. 145 n.), and the conception of the position of woman (p. 156 n.), which obtained in the times in which the legends grew up. Some of the conceptions are directly the reverse of those with which we are familiar; one hero must die when he touches the earth (p. 151), instead of being strengthened by every contact with her, as was Antæus, of Grecian fable. Very many of the stories either mention or describe the hero's enjoying a bath (p. 190). So many are obscure that incoherency has come to be considered a characteristic of Irish saga. Some very interesting material would find a place in a study of the idea of a Messiah, as found in literature not Hebrew. Remembering that the study deals with phenomena connected with, and proceeding from, the Irish mind, it is pardonable to expect, at least occasionally, something of humorous character. But in only a few of the stories studied are there traces of humor (pp. 198 n., 217). The evidence seems to show that the humorous tales, many of them depending for their effect upon incongruity of situation (pp. 210, 212), came late in the history of early Ireland (pp. 201, 204, 207). Beauty, beyond occasional slight touches, is even more conspicuously absent, although to the author (p. 234) some of the tales seem worthy of the term 'beautiful.'

Such is the material which the author, who has been studying it for more than twenty-five years (p. 210 n.), proposes to discuss.

The plan of the work (pp. 134 f.) is first, as a basis, to fix chronologically, so far as is possible, the place of the Voyage of Bran in Irish literature; then to attempt to answer the questions, suggested by the main episode of the story, as to the nature, age, and origin on Gaelic soil of the conception of the Happy Otherworld. By comparison of the Bran with other remains of Irish literature, the paradise ideal of the ancient Irish is to be elicited, and by comparison of this with the Christian ideal, the pre-Christian idea is to be got. The result is to be studied together with similar beliefs as found in Græco-Roman literature and that of other Aryian races, in the hope of

learning how far the non-Christian Irish belief is due to general Aryian mythic tradition, and how far to contact with the Græco-Roman world in very early and again in later Christian, but still, for the Irish, pre-historic, times. Whatever result is attained from this literary study must then be tested by archæology.

In following this plan the book is divided into twelve chapters, in the first two of which the Voyage of Bran is decided to belong in the last quarter of the seventh century (p. 141), and its conception of the Happy Otherworld is outlined. Parallel Irish tales of Connla (summary p. 149), Oisinn and Cuchulinn (summary p. 159), are studied in Chapter iii, while in Chapter iv is studied the *imrama* class, as typified by the *Voyage of Maelduin* (summary p. 173) and its derivate the *Navigatio S. Brendani*. Following upon the conception of the Happy Otherworld as the god's land (Chapter v) with the oversea and hollow hill (pp. 229 f.), lands of sensual (p. 182) and musical (p. 184) delight, came didactic and then romantic uses of the conception (Chapter vi). Independent and fragmentary preservations of the Happy Otherworld conception (immortality p. 212), the Irish version of the Christian Heaven, and the development of the Happy Otherworld idea in Irish legend, are discussed in Chapters vii, viii, and ix respectively. Such non-Irish Christian and Jewish analogues as the Anglo-Saxon *Phoenix*, the *Revelation of St. John*, the *Revelation of Peter*, the *Visio Pauli*, the *Vision of Saturus*, *Barlaam and Josaphat*, the *Vision of Fursa*, *Adamnan's Vision*, the *Sibylline Oracles*, the *Lost Ten Tribes*, the *Conflict of the Apostles*, and *The Book of Enoch*, are compared in Chapter x, which ends with a study of the relation of Christian to Classic eschatology. The accounts of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Lucian, Horace, Claudian, and many other Classic authors are discussed in Chapter xi (pp. 281 f., 293 f.). Chapter xii, and last, studies Scandinavian (pp. 308 f.), Iranian, and Indian (p. 312) accounts. Pages 326 to 328 give a valuable chronological summary of the history of the idea, while the general conclusion of the work is given on page 331.

It is in the presentation that one notes most of the faults of the work since they grow, or seem to do so, from a desire to make it

both a popular and a scholarly book. No attempt is made to print the valuable bibliography which must have been gathered in the course of the study; the reader must be content with what scattered references, not always full, scholarly, or uniformly stated, he is able to gather here and there in the text and notes, and with a *List of Works Quoted in an Abbreviated Form* (p. 109), which contains but eleven titles, and these not alphabetically arranged.

The summaries given at the head of each chapter are brought together at the beginning of the volume, where they form an admirably accurate and full table of *Contents*, five pages in length. It is, however, much of a disappointment which the reader experiences upon turning to page 332, whither he is directed for the index to the volume, and finding a blank page only. A two-line note at foot of page 331 is to the effect that the index is delayed until the second part of the study, which, we are elsewhere informed, may be completed in another year or may never be completed.

The essence of the work shows the author a scholar, and evidences, in addition to his general familiarity with the realm (pp. 251 f.), that the particulars of the present work have been exhaustively considered. The field thus thoroughly examined for material, this material has been well and clearly worked over. Whatever of indefiniteness there may be in the volume is in the presentation, there is ample evidence that the problems and their solutions are clear in the mind of the author. The statements of fact are always fair; the reasoning is usually clear, forcible, and just, and the conclusions sane. Above all, there are no *ad hoc* arguments (pp. 139, 163). Upon important questions the minority report is always given, so that the reader may form his own conclusions, whether they agree with those of the author or not (pp. 301, 304).

The work is eminently honest. Indeed the extreme carefulness usually exercised against forming unwarranted conclusions may be the cause of the comparative meagreness of the conclusion to the whole volume. It is scarcely to be wondered at if a reader who has gone through the two hundred and thirty pages of the essay, feels that he has not got his due

when he arrives at the seven lines of tentative conclusion with which the volume closes (p. 331):

"The vision of the Happy Otherworld found in Irish mythic romances of the eighth and following centuries is substantially pre-Christian; it finds its closest analogues in that state of Hellenic mythic belief which precedes the modification of the Hellenic religion consequent upon the spread of Orphic-Pythagorean doctrines and with these it forms the most archaic Aryan presentment of the divine and happy land we possess."

For further conclusion one is referred to the, yet to be completed, second part of the study, on the Celtic doctrine of re-birth, which has been here and there mentioned throughout the work (pp. 134, 176 n.).

In the absence of any more definite and final conclusion upon the main theme of the essay—this tentative one is in no wise to be minimized—the value of the work is principally in systematically combining masses of detail hitherto well-nigh inaccessible to the general student. As valuable as the study is in its present form, one cannot help wishing that the summaries, given at various places throughout the essay, had been gathered together in a concluding chapter, which might have served as a starting-point from which the student of comparative literature might work back into the body of the essay, which is too long and too hard to read through, when on the search for details. Such a chapter and an index would have greatly increased the general usefulness of Mr. Nutt's essay, which will always be referred to as a valuable contribution to sound scholarship.

CLYDE B. FURST.

Philadelphia.

ENGLISH POETRY.

Landscape in Poetry from Homer to Tennyson. By FRANCIS T. PALGRAVE. London: Macmillan and Co., 1897. 8vo, pp. xi, 297.

IN *Landscape in Poetry* Professor Palgrave shows the same fine taste with which, in 1861, he compiled the *Golden Treasury*. The passages he quotes form a delightful anthology of poetic landscape; otherwise the book is disappointing.

In the paragraph (p. 4) in which he names the books he has found helpful he betrays a curious insularity. He is indebted, he says, to Humboldt's *Cosmos*, Shairp's *Poetic Interpretation of Nature*, two books on Art, three on Latin Literature, and a Greek Anthology—all but the *Cosmos* by *Englishmen*. To mention only the most important, he apparently does not know Veitch's *Feeling for Nature in Scottish Poetry* (1887); nor de Laprade's *La Sentiment de Nature* (1866-8); nor Biese's *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (1888); nor Phelps' *Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement* (1893); nor Miss Reynold's *The Treatment of Nature in English Poetry between Pope and Wordsworth* (1896). Certainly no German writer, and hardly any university-bred American, would be so oblivious of foreign contributions to his subject.

Professor Palgrave begins with what he calls "almost a truism," namely, that both painting and poetry "are bound to exhibit Nature as seen through, coloured, and penetrated by the poet's or the painter's soul" (p. 2). Zola says, more sententiously, "Art is Nature seen through a temperament." After a brief discussion, the poet's attitude toward nature is classified as follows (I say "nature," for Professor Palgrave uses "nature" and "landscape" promiscuously, nearly always meaning "nature").

I. "Objects were painted singly and with a few clear touches."

II. "Landscape . . . appears as the background to human life." In any spontaneous literature, I. is soon followed, even in Homer, by II.

III. "Deep interest in the landscape, a certain passion for it as such." This, he says, results from city life. If so, why were the eighteenth century English poets so slow to feel the charm of nature?

IV. "More distinctly modern is the attempt to penetrate the inner soul of the landscape itself." This, of course, is Romantic.

The above classification is broadly true of the European literatures of the last twenty-five hundred years; but its application is seriously affected by the fact that very many poets have

gone through all these stages in their own poetry.

The two chapters on Landscape in Greek Poetry are hardly more than an anthology, and leave the false impression that the author has given all the landscape touches worth noting. In Latin literature, to which he gives two chapters, he finds, "a profounder passion for country life" than in Greek literature.

The sixth chapter is given to Hebrew poetry, in which Professor Palgrave finds that the "landscape is treated as a direct source of gladness to the heart" (p. 75). The passages quoted, however, seem inspired not so much by love of nature for itself, or because God made it, as by patriotism or homesickness.

With the chapters on Early Italian poetry, Celtic and Gaelic poetry, and Anglo-Saxon poetry, Professor Palgrave finishes his very incomplete preliminary survey, and in the chapter on Chaucer and his successors takes up his main subject, Landscape in English Poetry.

The discussion of landscape in Elizabethan poetry is entirely lacking in specific conclusions. The remarks on Shakspeare are especially inadequate; the reverence due our greatest poet seems to preclude frankness of speech or directness of treatment.

On page 159, Professor Palgrave's friendship has led him into an amusing anticlimax; he puts Milton "in company—at least it pleases me to fancy—with Homer and Sophocles, with Vergil, with Dante, with Tennyson."

"Vaughan," he says (p. 163), "had a deep imaginative sympathy with tree and blossom, animal and bird." He clinches his point with Vaughan's description of his Bible, in which he tells how the paper was once a seed, the wood of the cover once a tree, and ends,

"Thou knewest this harmless beast, when he
Did live and feed by thy decree
On each green thing; then slept—well fed—
Clothed with this skin, which now lies spread
A covering o'er this aged book."

Surely, if ever a passage bore the stamp of seventeenth century love of conceits, this does.

The chapter on Landscape in eighteenth century Poetry contains nothing that has not been commonplace for many years. Dr. Phelps' and Miss Reynolds' books leave this

very unsatisfactory chapter hopelessly out of date.

The comments on the early Romanticists and the Victorian poets are admirable, but almost entirely general. The author shows a fondness for neglected poets, of whom he calls to our attention no fewer than eight. Chapter xvii ends ingloriously with a sigh for one of these. Another fault, a tendency to make the book a catch-all for fragmentary dicta of various sorts, leads him to close the volume, not with a summary of results, but with a page-long eulogy of Tennyson, a graceful tribute from the friend of nearly fifty years, but nevertheless distinctly out of place.

As said at first, the book is a delightful anthology, the product of delicate sensibility, but lacking in results—in short, the work of a gifted dilettante.

I note only one misprint: "*Fra Filippo Lippi*" (p. 97).

EDWARD PAYSON MORTON.
Indiana University.

THE KINGIS QUAIR AGAIN.

Jacques 1^{er} D'Écosse fut-il poète? Étude sur l'authenticité du "Cahier du roi." Par J. J. JUSSEMAND. Paris, 1897.

THE ingenious attack of Mr. J. T. T. Brown on the hitherto undisputed claim of James I. of Scotland to the authorship of this poem (noticed in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. xii, col. 115) aroused a discussion in the *Athenæum*, one of the contributors to which was M. J. J. Jusserand, well known for his studies of England in the fourteenth century, and other works. M. Jusserand has since summed up the whole question in an article in the *Revue Historique*, Tom. 64, a deprint of which, by the author's courtesy, is before us.

M. Jusserand's line of argument is much the same as that indicated in the notice above alluded to, though, of course, much more fully worked out; and the conclusion is the same, that while Mr. Brown's objections are certainly entitled to consideration, he has by no means proved his case.

The strongest of these objections—that founded on the silence of Dunbar, who, in his

catalogue of dead poets makes no mention of James I., though he was writing at the court of James IV., great grandson of the royal poet; and the absence of all historical mention of so remarkable a poem earlier than that of Maior about a hundred years after—these *argumenta ex silentio*, though striking, are by no means conclusive. M. Jusserand parallels them with a similar silence in France concerning the poems of Charles of Orleans, a contemporary of James I., also of royal line (he was grandson of Charles V., and father of Louis XII.) and like James, a prisoner in England. Yet the admirable poetic works of this prince were absolutely ignored from his death in 1465 until the eighteenth century—a more surprising silence than that in James's case. One thing we know; and that is, that in Dunbar's lifetime the *Kingis Quair* was attributed to James by at least two persons; namely, the two scribes who copied it into the unique Bodleian MS., and there is no doubt that they found it so ascribed in their original MS.

It is, no doubt, a rather remarkable thing that a work of such excellence, and so devoid of all offence, should be preserved in but a single copy written toward the close of the fifteenth century; but when we remember how much of Scottish literature has perished utterly, we can hardly found any argument upon this fact.

The weakness of Mr. Brown's argument from the dialect is very well exposed by his critic. The language of the poem is Scottish, but mingled with Southern forms and Chaucerian phrases; and this is precisely what we should expect from a Scottish prince, living in England from his eleventh to his twenty-ninth year, on the one hand in daily intercourse with the Scots who we know shared his captivity, and looking forward to his restoration to the throne of Scotland; and, on the other hand, also in daily intercourse with speakers of Southern English, and—as he tells us himself—a devoted student of the works of "his masters," Gower and Chaucer. M. Jusserand might have added that it is precisely such a dialect as a Scottish forger would *not* have used.

Mr. Brown argues that James would never have been so "ungracious" as to address the lady of his affections in the "rude speech"

and "rugged dialect" of Scotland. M. Jusserand, conceding the rudeness, makes answer "Que nous parle-t-on de la rudesse du dialecte? Les paroles d'un amant sont toujours douces aux oreilles d'une amante." A better answer would be that the literary Scottish of the fifteenth century was by no means a rude and rugged dialect, but a highly cultivated and polished speech, enriched and refined by generations of scholars and poets, and quite capable of holding its own with the language spoken on the Thames. Let any one who doubts compare the language of Henryson with that of Lydgate or Hoccleve, and see which suffers by the comparison.

The resemblance between the *Kingis Quair* and the *Court of Love*, M. Jusserand treats too lightly. It does not consist merely in peculiar words or phrases—though these are numerous enough to have considerable cumulative weight—but in an important feature of both poems. Both poets visit the Court of Love (or of Venus) at which they see various groups or orders of lovers: aged persons who had been faithful to love throughout their lives: persons who had been devoted to a religious life, but have served love secretly; and persons who complain bitterly because they had been forced into the cloister in their tender youth, and must now forego the bliss of love. Now such a visit, with a survey of the various classes of lovers, happy and unhappy, is necessitated by the very design of the *Court of Love*; whereas in the *Kingis Quair* it is quite unnecessary, and brought in somewhat by force. There seems then little probability that the author of the *Court of Love* imitated the *Kingis Quair*, and much that the imitation was the other way. This is Mr. Brown's contention, which M. Jusserand meets by denying that there is any evidence of imitation. Both, as it seems to the present writer, too readily accept Mr. Skeat's dictum, that the *Court of Love* belongs to the early sixteenth century. His only proof is the existence of non-Chaucerian forms. But Chaucer did not monopolize all the English of the fourteenth century by any means, nor were his rules of versification, management of the final *e*, etc., accepted by all his contemporaries. That Chaucer did not write the *Court of Love*, we may readily admit; but

to say that it could not have been written until more than a hundred years after Chaucer, is another matter, and comes perilously near the verge of dogmatism.

Curiously enough, neither M. Jusserand nor Mr. Brown makes any reference to the singular fact that the author of the *Kingis Quair* dedicates his poem to his "dear masters, Gower and Chaucer," while no imitation of Gower, nor trace of his influence has been discovered in it. On the other hand, no acknowledgment is made of indebtedness to the *Court of Love*. It is surprising that Mr. Brown did not venture the conjecture that his supposed Scottish forger believed the *Court of Love* to be from Gower's pen; an error which James was not so likely to make.

Near the end of the poem, the lover, expressing his joy at having at last won his lady's grace, says—

"And this floure
So herly has unto my help attendit,
That from the deth hir man scho has deffendit."

No one can read this without thinking of the tragedy at Perth, and Queen Jane's unavailing attempt to save her husband's life. But Mr. Brown cites this passage as evidence that the writer knew the story of the assassination, and made a *prædictio post eventum*. Even if the hyperbole of being brought from death to life by attaining the favor of the beloved one, were not a commonplace of the old love-poets, the meaning here clearly is that the lover owes his life to his lady—that she has rescued him from death; whereas, unhappily, Queen Jane did not save her husband from the daggers of his murderers; so that the alleged forger predicted after the event just what did not occur.

M. Jusserand applies a very minute scrutiny to the alleged discrepancies in dates and allusions, with the conclusion that James is right, and that his opponent has followed false guides. To the mind of the present writer these discrepancies, even if real, would have next to no weight. In a fanciful semi-allegorical poem like this, we do not expect the accuracy of a serious autobiography; and James was quite capable of saying "yeris thre" for "yeris foure," if the rime required it, or of putting the sun in the sign of the Ram, simply

because Chaucer's pilgrims set out under that constellation.

On the whole, M. Jusserand has effectively met the objections raised; and until a better equipped *advocatus diaboli* takes up the contention, the present writer agrees with him that the claim of James has not been invalidated.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH PHONETICS.

Artikulations- und Hörübungen, von H. KLINGHARDT: Praktisches Hilfsbuch der Phonetik für Studierende und Lehrer. Mit 7 in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. Cöthen: Otto Schulze, 1897; pp. viii, 253.

THE author explains in an interesting introduction the origin and aims of his work, which is the result of his prolonged experience as an enthusiastic and skilful teacher of modern languages in German colleges. It is not meant to increase the number of excellent text-books that treat of phonetics in general, or of French, German and English phonetics in particular; it is to be looked upon, rather, as a phonetic drill-book for young instructors, and students preparing to be teachers of modern languages. They are not expected to get from it, or from it alone, their knowledge of phonetics, but are advised to use it either before, or at the same time with, the systematic study of a regular text-book like Vietor's *Elemente der Phonetik und Orthoepie des Deutschen, Englischen und Französischen*. The author wishes to teach them by his own example how to make use of such knowledge, which, unless assisted by well-directed and long-continued practical exercises, is liable to remain barren theory, unprofitable for teaching or learning a foreign language, as well as of very doubtful value for carrying on scientific research. Thus, all his descriptions, suggestions and advice, and all the exercises he recommends, tend to awaken and strengthen the desire of independent observation and to give a thorough control of the speech-organs:

Was meine jungen Fachgenossen betrifft, so hoffe ich, dass die von mir gebotenen Beschrei-

bungen und vorgeschlagenen Übungen unter allen Umständen dazu dienen werden, zu ihrem phonetischen Wissen auch noch einiges phonetische Können d. i. einige phonetische Fertigkeit hinzuzufügen."¹

Mr. Klinghardt is a good teacher not only in the class-room but in most of his writings, and especially in the present book. His explanations are exceedingly clear (*anschaulich*), though sometimes rather long. He does not employ much apparatus, but contents himself with a few diagrams in the first part of his work, and requires of his readers only to do exactly as he does, to use their own eyes, aided by a mirror, their own ears and their own speech-muscles, in examining and reproducing his observations and experiments so as to become their own observations and experiments. Such a procedure, highly commendable, and in fact the only method to be recommended for the study of a phonetic book, demands time and patience; but in the author's opinion, the student does not need to read the whole work at once, and may take up at different times any chapter he may think most convenient and most useful for the occasion.

Some oral instruction in phonetics I regard as almost indispensable for the beginner. However, the elements of this science once fully understood, I think he will go on very well by reading the *Artikulations- und Hörübungen* in the manner prescribed or suggested by the author, and he will doubtless learn from him to train his eye, ear, and speech-muscles, to observe phonetic phenomena independently, and to distinguish clearly all the different sounds and articulations, or series of sounds and articulations, mentioned or hinted at in Mr. Klinghardt's work.

I frankly confess that at first I could not help looking with some suspicion at:

Part I. *Nichtsprachliche Artikulationen und Schalle*.

A. Die Schlussmittel des Kehlkopfes, a. Bau des Kehlkopfes und seiner Schlussmittel; b. Artikulationen der Schlussmittel des Kehlkopfes und zugehörige Schalle.

B. Das Gaumensegel, a. Bau des Gaumensegels; b. Artikulationen des Gaumensegels.

C. Der Unterkiefer mit Zunge und Lippe, a. Bau des Unterkiefers (mit Zunge und Lippe); b. Artikulationen des Unterkiefers (der Zunge und Lippe).

¹ Page 7.

² Pages 11-75.

This preliminary part appeared to me altogether too long, and seemed to treat too diffusely of some well-known phenomena of articulation like laughing, coughing, swallowing, which are in no direct relation to the subject of the book—speech. But I have changed my opinion, after a careful study of the whole work, and am inclined to think it the best done and most important part, since the book is planned especially for beginners in phonetics. In the first place, the nature of these common-place phenomena is, in reality, not well-known and not well understood, precisely because they are common-place things; and, secondly, they serve admirably the pedagogic ends of the author, who explains very well in connection with them the structure of the upper breath and speech-organs, and also prepares and facilitates, in this way, the explanation of the phenomena of speech proper in Part II.

The First Part, therefore, is a sort of *pro-pædæutic* introduction to the phonetic study of every language. It will be read with much profit by students of any nationality, provided they understand German sufficiently; and the statements and descriptions contained in it are such as not to call forth any critical remarks on the part of the expert. It is different with Part II: *Sprachliche Artikulationen und Schalle*.

A. Die Schlussmittel des Kehlkopfes, a. Weite Öffnung (gehauchte Laute); b. Knorpelenge (geflüsterte Laute); c. Ritzenenge (getönte Laute); d. Kehlkopfverschluss (Explosivlaut); e. Resonanzräume und Resonanzen.

B. Das Gaumensegel.

C. Der Unterkiefer mit Zunge und Lippe, a. Allgemeines; b. die einzelnen Lautreihen: Konsonantenreihen, Vokalreihen und Gleitlautreihen.

According to the author's opinion, repeatedly and clearly enough expressed, he has written his work chiefly for the present and future teachers of modern languages, that is, French and English, in German schools and colleges. But if we consider only this class of readers, who would naturally expect to find a great deal of information especially adapted to the needs and requirements of their vocation, the instruction of French and English, he evidently speaks, in the principal part,⁴ by far too much

of German sounds and articulations, and too little of English and French phonetics. He says nothing of the peculiar treatment of French plosives without a breath-glide before vowels, in opposition to the linguistic habits of Germans (p^h, t^h, k^h); nothing of the formation of narrow and wide, tense and lax vowels,—a very important topic, to be sure, in the study of French and English vocalism; and nothing definite of the articulation and acoustic quality of mixed vowels,—a very characteristic feature of English vocalism. Indeed, he mentions foreign sounds and articulations very sparingly and only for the sake of comparison and illustration. I, therefore, think his work offers more and greater advantages to two classes of readers which he does not seem to have had in view at all; that is to say, such Germans as desire to get a thorough knowledge of the phonetic system of their mother tongue, and foreigners who would like to study German phonetics considered from the German point of view, and treated by a native well-acquainted with other languages and the general purport of his subject. It is principally on account of the latter class that the book deserves warm commendation and unlimited praise in an American journal.

Doubtless, the German neo-philologists will find also in the Second Part enough to interest and help them. They will more easily get by the aid of both parts an adequate and an extensive training in general phonetics than by means of any other book I know of; and guided by some of the skilful and pedagogic exercises suggested in the second part, they will discover the best means of "hearing," observing and understanding all the peculiarities of their pupils' German pronunciation, varying from province to province, from town to town, from community to community, from individual to individual, even in the same class-room. Thus they will learn to explain these peculiarities of sound by corresponding peculiarities of articulation, and such an experience will best enable them to smooth over the difficulties their pupils have to encounter, and successfully to correct the mistakes they are liable to make in their first endeavors to

³ Pages 76-250.

⁴ That is, in Part II.

⁵ Cf. pages 213, 217, and Nachträge, pages 252-253.

imitate foreign sounds and sound-combinations.

I am glad to hear that the excellent work has already won many friends among the author's colleagues in Germany. One of them, Dr. H. Schmidt, a practical teacher of modern languages at the *Realschule* or *Realgymnasium* of Altona-Ottensen, speaks of it with sincere admiration, "without the least admixture of fault-finding criticism," in a long article of the last issue of the *Neueren Sprachen*.⁶ This article is remarkable for the intelligent and complete account it gives of the contents of the whole book.

The Supplement⁷ contains some critical remarks upon Part ii, which the author received from Mr. Paul Passy and Mr. Vietor during and after the composition of his work. I shall add a few more, but I shall be very brief, giving by no means all of the notes I have collected.

The division into breathed, whispered and voiced sounds (*gehauchte, geflüsterte, getönte Laute*), which goes like a *Leit-Motiv* through the different chapters of this part, is very convenient, giving a great deal of symmetry to K's exposition and rendering it very interesting and instructive. It seems to me, however, that whisper is in this way allowed too prominent a place in a book treating of speech. For whisper is nothing but hybrid speech, a poor substitute for genuine speech caused by disease or by particular temporary conditions of the speaker. I also think that the separation of whispered sounds (*Knorpelenge*: cartilaginous glottis open, glottis proper or vocal chords closed), on the one hand, and breathed and voiced sounds (*weite Öffnung*: the whole glottis open; *Ritzenge*: cartilaginous glottis closed, and glottis proper open with vocal chords brought near enough to one another to vibrate), on the other hand, is never strictly carried out in the real life of language, and that what we recognize as whisper seldom agrees exactly with K's definition.

§§31-32:⁸ *h*—gehauchte vokale: *hu, ho, ha, he, hi*—*g, r, m, n, ŋ*.

Page 78: Man hat diesen *h*-Laut in vielfach verschiedener Weise zu bestimmen gesucht.

⁶ July, 1897, pages 199-215.

⁷ Nachträge, pages 250-253.

⁸ Pages 76-81.

Da ich mich hier grundsätzlich (!) nicht auf die Erörterung abweichender Ansichten einlasse, so kann ich den Leser nur auffordern, selbst meine Darstellung nachzuprüfen.

I doubt whether *h* is the same sound in every language; for instance, that German *h* is the same as English *h* or, even, *h* in French dialects (K. does not say expressly whether he speaks only of German *h*, or of *h* in general); I also doubt the opinion that *h* is formed with the same position of the vocal chords (wide open) as the voiceless or, as K. calls them, breathed consonants *p, f, t, s*, etc.; that *h* must be identified with breathed vowels, that it must be pronounced with the same vowel position of the mouth organs as the vowels by which it is followed, and that this vowel position must be a primary element in the formation of *h*. I wonder what view K. takes of the position and movement of the vocal chords in pronouncing *p—a* in French *par*, and *p^h—a* in German *Paar* (he never mentions French *p, t, k* before vowels)? To solve these and similar difficult questions, we need better aids than eye, ear, mirror, and the feeling of the speech-muscle; here, we are forced to make use of phonetic instruments and the researches of experimental phoneticians like Rousselot.⁹

One looks in vain for the plosives *p, t, k—b, d, g* in the three long chapters of Part ii, A, a—c, pp. 76-117, where K. speaks of breathed, whispered and voiced sounds, vowels as well as fricative and liquid consonants; and one is quite astonished to meet with *k, t, p* or, rather, the *k-, t-, p-* series at the end of the last chapter of Part ii, A, e (*Resonanzräume und Resonanzen*), p. 136, where he compares them, in regard to formation and resonance, with the glottal plosive or glottal catch. This plosive is fully treated and well explained in a preceding separate chapter, Part ii, A, d: *Kehlkopfverschluss. (Explosivlaut.)* The author then mentions a *k-* and *g-* series, a *t-* and *d-* series and a *p-* and *b-* series, beside seven other series of consonants in Part ii, B, § 75 (*Artikulation mit Hochstellung des Gaumensegels*: 10 *Konsonantengruppen*), and *k, t, p—g, d, b* (whis-

⁹ On this occasion I wish to call the reader's attention to Abbé Rousselot's new book, the first part of which has just come out: *Principes de phonétique expérimentale*, Paris and Leipzig, H. Welter, 1897.

pered)—*g, d, b* several times in Part ii, C, a, § 76 (*gehauchte, geflüsterte, getönte Luftströme und Sprechlaute*), § 77 (die Organe, mit denen auf diesen Luftströmen gespielt wird: Unterkiefer, Unterlippe, Zunge). In the last chapter of the book, Part ii, C, b, he again leaves out the plosives among the *Konsonantenreihen* (*Kratzlaute, Zischlaute, Lispellaute*, etc.), and finally places them among the *Gleitlautreihen*, or series of glides: § 95 die *p, t*- und *k*-Reihen, § 96 die *lenes*-Reihen (*b, d, g, h, q, g*).

We may define *p, t, k—b, d, g* as stop-articulations, labial and lingual (with different parts of the tongue), either preceded by a closing glide and followed by an opening glide (for instance, *apa*), or only followed by an opening glide (for instance, *pa*), or only preceded by a closing glide (for instance, *ap*, in German and English, but rarely or, at least, not necessarily in French; compare German *Knapp*, English *cap*, and French *pape*), and rendered audible by these glides. But in spite of the definition, they appear to us, to our ear and to our linguistic feeling (*Sprachgefühl*), as individual, single sounds, and we are not justified in calling them glides, although glides are an important element in their formation. We perceive clapping, whipping, cutting, splitting, tearing, as noises; and we are quite right in considering as noise-sounds or consonants the plosives *p, t, k*, etc., which are similar to those noises in nature.

§§ 73-74: Artikulation mit Ruhelage des Gaumensegels: a. *η, n, m*; b. nasalierte Vokale. § 75: Nasalierte Vokale sind aber keine mustergültigen Laute für uns, sie gehören nur den Dialekten, nicht der deutschen Hochausprache an¹⁰ Die drei letzten unter den konsonantischen Reihen (*k, g—t, d—p, b*) werden durch solche artikulatorische Veränderung (that is, by pronouncing them with the uvula lowered as in ordinary breathing) akustisch bis zu völliger Unkenntlichkeit entstellt¹¹ . . . Der akustische Unterschied solcher Konsonanten, die fälschlich mit Athemlage des Gaumensegels gesprochen werden, von ihren korrekten, mit Hochstellung gesprochenen Gegenstücken ist vor allen Dingen eine auffallende Undeutlichkeit.¹²

Habitual nasalizers, individual persons, and the entire population of certain provinces, for

instance Holstein, belonging to a country in whose literary or ruling dialect nasal vowels are not recognized as correct by the usage of the educated classes, are liable to modify all the sounds, but the degree and extent of nasalizing is very variable in their pronunciation. Often, their articulation, generally speaking, not only in regard to the uvula, is extremely weak. This has been very well observed by K. in Holstein pronunciation, and he gives some very curious examples of feeble articulation in § 93. With nasalizers, vowels as well as consonants become more or less indistinct, and together with the other consonants, also *m, n* and *η*, because the closure of the oral passage, with lips and tongue, is carried out imperfectly, and the uvula is lowered without vigor and energy. It would have been useful to compare in §§ 73-75 the vowels of mere nasal twang with the regular nasal vowels in French, which, in consequence of their peculiar formation and quite in accordance with the general character of the language, are exceedingly clear and distinct. I do not believe that even inveterate nasalizers change *k, t, p—g, d, b* into real *η, n, m* (voiceless and voiced); *Bock, Bett, Kap—Lage, Lade, Labz*. They cannot resist the desire and necessity of making themselves understood, and generally manage, by means of slight changes of articulation, to distinguish sufficiently between *η, n, m* (voiceless and voiced) and nasalized *k, t, p—g, d, b*.

§85:¹³ Die *r*-Laute, a. ungerollte *r*-Laute, [*r*] und [*k*] (getönt, geflüstert, gehaucht), b. gerollte *r*-Laute, *r* und *R* (getönt und gehaucht).

Cf. *Nachträge*, pp. 251-252, with Passy's and Viator's remarks and Klinghardt's reply, both very interesting.

I think K. is not justified in placing mere substitutes, secondary sounds, the untrilled *r* and *R*=*[r]* and *[R]* before the original and primary sounds, the trilled *r* and *R*. Even the trilled *R* (uvular or velar, cf. Northern French *roi*) is only a secondary sound in relation to the trilled *r* (lingual, cf. Southern French *roi*); and it would be unwise to place *R* before *r*, although it would agree with the general order of the book, which is based upon

¹⁰ Page 147.

¹¹ Page 147.

¹² Page 148.

¹³ Pages 186-196.

the natural position of the articulating organs, beginning with the glottis. But *R* is very similar to *r* in the manner of articulation and in acoustic impression. An ordinary hearer, unprejudiced by phonetic studies, cannot easily distinguish a well-trilled *R* from an *r*. However, the two substitutes which K. puts in the first place are deprived of the trill, the characteristic feature of an *r*-sound, and are really very different sounds. If we call them untrilled *r* and *R*, and mark them, in phonetic script, by signs derived from these letters, for instance *ɹ* and *ʀ*, we do so only for convenience and for historical reasons. When we hear them in a literary language or in dialects related to it, we naturally identify them with *r*, and are predisposed to perceive them as consonants resembling a trilled *r* or *R*; for we are influenced by school-instruction and orthography, and accustomed to hear a real *r* or *R* in the same words in the pronunciation of other speakers, in the same region or in other parts of the country. We, therefore, hesitate to consider those sounds as identical with, or very similar to, some of the other fricative consonants to be met with in the same language or dialect, and are inclined to discover differences that, perhaps, do not exist in reality. But if a missionary should hear the so-called untrilled *r* (lingual, with several varieties, cf. *run* in English and American pronunciation) and *R* (uvular or velar, cf. *parler* in popular Parisian pronunciation and *fragen*, frequent in Central and North German pronunciation), sometimes voiced and sometimes voiceless, in the speech of a savage tribe, and should endeavor to fix a few sentences of such a dialect in phonetic spelling, I am sure he would not hesitate very long: he would transcribe those sounds, on the one hand, by *ð* (*b*) or *ʒ* (*j*), or perhaps even *z* (*s*) or *ʃ* (*c*), and, on the other hand, by *ɣ* (*x*), and it would never occur to him that he heard something similar to an *r*-sound.

§ 90¹⁴. . . Die ganze Reihe *a*, *ɔ*, *o*, *u*, lässt sich, wenn nicht in vollendeter, so doch in befriedigender (!) Weise, bei durchaus passivem Verhalten nicht nur der Zunge sondern auch der Lippen, durch stufenweise Hebung des Unterkiefers bilden, welche immer stärkere, flache

und passive Verkleinerung des Mundlippen-thores zu folge hat

I think K. is mistaken if he believes that the formation of *ɔ*, *o*, *u* assumed by him will be accepted by many people as satisfactory. These vowels produced in the manner described in § 90 are other sounds; they are not *ɔ*, *o*, *u*; they are very different from them in spite of some vague acoustic resemblance. Suppose an Englishman, speaking French, should pronounce (which he really very often does) the English mixed sound *ä* (*fur*, *burn*) instead of *æ* in the French words *heure*, *beurre*, *honneur*; I admit that he utters a vowel somewhat similar to the French *æ*; for if there were no similarity, the Englishman would not select that mixed vowel of his native phonetic system, and he would not be understood by the hearer, in pronouncing *heure*, *beurre*, *honneur*. But I am not at all satisfied with his pronunciation, and do not admit that he has pronounced the vowel *æ* "if not perfectly, yet satisfactorily," or that French *æ* and English *ä* are the same sounds.

It seems that the author is rather frequently carried away by the charm of his method of treating sounds rather in series of variable sounds than in the more or less fixed form of the normal sounds of a definite language, and he is, therefore, apt to overlook the importance of such normal sounds in phonetic discussions. This renders it difficult to understand, in every case, the exact meaning of his statements. Cf. *y*, *i*, *ï*, in § 90, especially pp. 213 and 217, with P. Passy's remark and K's reply, *Nachträge*, pp. 252-253.

§ 91:¹⁵ Der unbestimmte Vokal *ɔ* . . . Allmählich wird man aber lernen, *a* und *ɔ* abwechselnd bei vollkommen oder nahezu (!) identischer Zungeneinstellung hervorzubringen. Der einzige (?) Artikulationsakt, den man dann aber immer noch bei dem Uebergange *ɔ* > *a* beobachten wird, das ist eine plötzliche stärkere Anspannung des Gaumensegels, welche mit Höherziehen und damit natürlich auch leichter Verschmälerung des vorher sehr breiten Gaumenthores verknüpft ist. Und nunmehr suche man durch unermüdliche Uebung eine sichere, bewusste Herrschaft zu gewinnen über die Bedingungen für Bildung von *ɔ*-Ruhelage sämtlicher (?) Organe, nämlich des in angegebener Weise eingestellten Unterkiefers, der Lippen, der Zunge (?) und des Gaum-

¹⁴ Page 226.

¹⁵ Pages 227-231.

ensegels (in Hochstellung)—und über diejenigen, welche die Voraussetzung bilden für Bildung von *a*, nämlich Ruhelage von Unterkiefer, Lippen und Zunge, aber kräftige Anspannung des Gaumensegels.¹⁶ . . . Zwei hiesige Ärzte (in Rendsburg) haben bei einer gemeinschaftlichen Untersuchung mit dem Kehlkopfspiegel die von mir S. 230 angedeutete Artikulation des Kehlkopfdeckels direkt beobachtet: wenn ich von *a* zu *ə*, was allerdings erst eingeübt sein will, überging, so senkte sich der Deckel, und richtete sich beim Übergange von *ə* zu *a* auf.¹⁷

§ 91 is one of the most interesting paragraphs in the whole book. But it seems strange that the author speaks here only of the German weak (unstressed) vowel *ə* in *hatte*, *schreibe*, *Katze*, *gesehen*, *erfahren*, *berichten*, and does not compare it with the analogous sounds, weak (unstressed), lax, wide, in French and English: French *ə* (*degré*), slightly rounded, between *ø* and *æ*, sometimes nearer to *æ*, sometimes nearer to *ø*, tongue-articulation certainly approaching the "mixed" position; English *ə* (*never*), unrounded, representing a variety or rather several varieties of the mixed vowel *ä* (cf. *fur*). It is still stranger that he identifies, without any comment,¹⁸ this German *ə*, so different from French *ə* and English *ə*, with mere voice, the *Stimnton* (produced by the vocal chords alone and not modified by any tongue-articulation), which, of course, is the same in German, French and English, and which he derives, with his students and readers, by a very skilful process from the voiced consonants *m*, *n*, *l*, *g*, *d*, *b*, *v*, *z*, etc. He assumes that the tongue holds a neutral, quiet position in pronouncing the common German *a*.¹⁹ This is true of a certain variety, perhaps the most frequent variety of German *a*, and, certainly, of K's own usual *a*. But it is impossible that the tongue holds the same neutral position in pronouncing German *ə* (*hatte*). The tongue-articulation of this sound is indeed very weak, but it is quite marked in my own pronunciation, and the movement of the tongue is very distinct, when I compare *ə* with *a*: *Aae=a:ə*. No doubt, the German *ə* can be very easily changed, and probably is rather frequently changed, into mere voice or *Stimm-*

ton in careless pronunciation. But, on the whole, it is a separate vowel with tongue-articulation, though rather variable in its nature, just like the other weak vowels, French *ə* and English *ə*; it is a mixed vowel, unrounded, lax, wide, and represents varieties of *ä*.²⁰ What K. reports respecting the different activity of velum and epiglottis in the production of *a* and *ə*, is highly instructive. It confirms what we know: German *ə* is a wide vowel, German *a* is generally a narrow vowel.

§ 92:²¹ *Vokaldiagramme*. In this paragraph, the author praises and explains again his own method of studying and teaching phonetics by the aid of ear, eye, mirror and speech-muscle, and speaks with much distrust and some contempt of the use of diagrams and sound-tablets. I do not approve of all that is here expressed, but I should not attempt criticism if the opinion advanced concerned only the instruction of young teachers and students of philology, and not the method to be followed by a modern language teacher in the class-room in schools and colleges. This is evidently the case, and changes the aspect of the question entirely. As a teacher of phonetics, K. is at liberty to use any method he likes; and he proves by his book that his method, in this respect, is an excellent one. But teaching phonetics, and teaching a foreign language are two very different things; and what is good and indispensable for the specialist, the philologist and the teacher, may be useless or of secondary importance, perhaps even hurtful, in a certain sense, for the general student who wishes to learn a foreign language.

1. A thorough knowledge of phonetics, theory and practice, general and special, is desirable and, I think, absolutely necessary for the one, since he has to *teach* the spoken language; the other needs very little phonetics—only so much as to be enabled to *learn* the correct pronunciation.

2. The aim of modern language instruction in schools and colleges is to teach a foreign language: the student learns to speak, read, and write, in different degrees of perfection, of course, in accordance with the special aims

¹⁶ Page 229.

¹⁷ K's letter of April 20, 1897.

¹⁸ Page 227.

¹⁹ Cf. § 90, pp. 209 f., and § 91, p. 229.

²⁰ Klinghardt and I use the signs of the international phonetic alphabet of the *Maître Phonétique*.

²¹ Pages 231-234.

of the class and the institution. Phonetics and grammar are not ends; they are aids and means to attain the end.

3. The value of grammar, in modern language instruction is about the same as that of phonetics. They ought to go together and ought to be treated alike, especially at the beginning rather through concrete examples than through abstract rules. Phonetics, it seems, is the best foundation to be built upon, for the grammatical study of a living tongue.

4. The amount of grammar, as well as of phonetics, to be taught in a class depends above all things on the age of the students: the older they are the more grammar and phonetics they will need; the younger they are the less they will need, and the better and the more easily they will learn the foreign language through direct imitation of the teacher, who, of course, must know it well himself.

5. Mr. Klinghardt is a staunch champion of what he calls, in a well-known book of his, "the imitative method." He advises the teacher to insist upon "direct imitation" as the best means of learning a foreign language, in regard to words, grammatical forms and constructions, and idiomatic expressions and phrases. I am surprised that he does not recommend "direct imitation" for the same purpose in regard to foreign sounds and sound-combinations.

6. The value of exercises in translating from the mother tongue into the foreign language and *vice versa*, which implies a continual comparing of the use of words, grammatical forms and constructions, and idiomatic expressions and phrases in the two languages, has been rightly contested by the adherents of the "reform-method." Translation exercises, if done moderately, may be of use in connection with the study of grammar, especially in the higher grades of language instruction, but they are hurtful at the beginning, since they tend to destroy the faculty of linguistic imitation which is usually very strong in younger students, and hinder them from learning the foreign language directly. I think it equally dangerous and may be as hurtful, especially at the beginning, to compare continually and systematically the sounds and sound-combinations of the mother

tongue with those of the foreign language.

7. The teacher, of course, has to study closely and know the native pronunciation of his students. But he can make use of this knowledge very often without comparing, and he may compare in many cases without his students being aware of it. I rather think that instead of being again and again reminded of their native pronunciation, they ought to be led to forget it while learning to pronounce foreign sounds in reading and speaking.

8. The best course to begin with, in teaching a living language, is always to enter *in medias res* as soon as possible, in every respect, and certainly also in regard to pronunciation. A few preliminary remarks and explanations about phonetics and the pronunciation of the two languages and some exercises with the foreign sounds are quite sufficient for the beginning. This can be done in a very short time and very conveniently by the aid of diagrams and charts. The signs which the student sees before him on these diagrams and charts represent for him *only* the *foreign* sounds, and *only* the *normal* sounds of the foreign language, and he has to practice these not in their isolated form, but by means of well-chosen keywords, which he also has continually before him, and which contain every sound in its natural environment of other foreign sounds. In this way he learns very quickly to find the famous *Indifferenzlage*, or basis of articulation, of the foreign language, and he will be well prepared to imitate correctly the teacher's pronunciation in other words and in whole sentences, and to read, under his guidance and strict control, phonetic texts in prose and verse, which will do the rest.

9. Such a method by no means excludes in the course of instruction an occasional comparing of native and foreign sounds. The teacher is doubtless even compelled to resort to the mother tongue and to the native dialect if he wishes to fight against, and do away with, certain individual defects of some of his students; for instance lisping, or certain dialectic peculiarities, like the voiceless pronunciation of the so-called "soft" consonants, *b, d, z*, etc., which are easily and persistently transmitted into the foreign language and often prove a

serious obstacle to the close imitation and correct acquisition of foreign sounds.

10. *Nota bene*.—The teacher's own pronunciation of the foreign language must be perfect, or at least sufficiently good. Otherwise, I believe, neither diagrams and charts with sounds and keywords, nor Klinghardt's exercises by the aid of ear, eye, mirror and speech-muscle will be of any use, and phonetics will be apt to become a by-word of ridicule.

§§ 94-96:²² Verschluss- und Öffnungs-Glides; die *p*-*t*- und *k*-Reihen; die *Lenes*-Reihen (*b*, *d*, *g*—*ḃ*, *ḋ*, *ḡ*).

Als Bezeichnung für die mittelst starken Luftdruckes gebildete Reihe (*p*, *t*, *k*) dürfte sich der Ausdruck *fortis* und für die mit schwachem Luftdrucke gebildete Reihe (*b*, *d*, *g*) der Ausdruck *lenis* empfehlen. Solche gehauchte *Lenes* herrschen allgemein in Süddeutschland und ebenso hier in der Rendsburger Gegend²³. . . Franzosen und Engländer fassen beide gehauchte Reihen, *p*, *t*, *k* und *ḃ*, *ḋ*, *ḡ* als gleichartig auf, d. h. die verschiedene Stärke des Luftdruckes hat für ihr Ohr keinen sprachlichen Wert; gehauchte Öffnungs-Glides sind für sie unter allen Umständen *p*, *t*, *k*. Für die Franzosen und Engländer wie für die meisten Norddeutschen und für unsere Bühnen gelten als echte *b*, *d*, *g* lediglich die Öffnungs-Glides des getönten Luftstromes²⁴. . . Natürlich sind aber die getönten Öffnungs-Glides *b*, *d*, *g* gerade so ausgesprochene '*Lenes*' wie die gehauchten *ḃ*, *ḋ*, *ḡ*, weil der schmale Luftstrom, welcher während des tönenden Schwingens der Kehlkopfflippen zwischen den *chordae vocales* empordringt, nur einen mässigen Luftdruck auf den Lippen- oder Zungenschluss auszuüben vermag.²⁵

I have already mentioned §§ 94-96 in connection with others in which K. speaks, or neglects to speak, of the plosive consonants. Here it is quite obvious again that we cannot arrive at a full understanding of the real nature of these consonants if we confine our observations almost exclusively to a single language. The pressure, or *Luftdruck*, is not at all weak when one pronounces French *b*, *d*, *g*; it seems to me as strong as when one pronounces French *p*, *t*, *k*. The two series of French plosives appear to my ear and "speech-muscle" as "hard" consonants or *fortes*. There is only one difference: French *p*, *t*, *k* are voiceless, and French *b*, *d*, *g* are, as a rule, strongly voiced, more so than North German

and English *b*, *d*, *g*. I think this view of the matter is confirmed by the fact that South and Central Germans who are accustomed to pronounce voiceless *Lenes* in their own language, do not perceive any difference between French *b*, *d*, *g* (*bain*, *dé*, *goût*) and French *p*, *t*, *k* (*pain*, *thé*, *coup*). Nevertheless, the difference that exists between the two series in French, is really very great. It is obscured and effaced only in cases of assimilation: cf. *forcé d[e] faire*; *je ne sais qu[e] dire*.

I hope that Rousselot and other experimental phoneticians will take up the whole question of plosives in several languages, and try to solve it by means of laryngoscopic and other phonetic instruments. I wish they would inform us by their investigations whether my conception and explanation of French *b*, *d*, *g* is right or wrong. At any rate, it is entirely at variance with Klinghardt's theory stated in one of the passages quoted above; and although I am pretty sure of my ear and "speech-muscle" in my own observations, I trust them, in such delicate questions, much less than the convincing proofs of Rousselot's experiments.

There are many more extremely interesting points in §§ 94-96 and in the last paragraph: "Die vokalischen Gleitlaute (Diphthonge)," but they would require a rather long discussion. I therefore prefer to close my review by again recommending Mr. Klinghardt's important work to the attention of every philologist, phonetician and language teacher.

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

SPANISH POETRY.

Los Cantares de Myo Cid, con una Introducción y Notas por Dr. EDUARDO LIDFORSS. Acta Universitatis Lundensis, Tom. xxi, 1895, Text; Tom. xxii, 1896, Notes. Lund: E. Malmström. 4to, pp. viii, 164.

A new publication of the *Poema del Cid* is a matter of the greatest interest, inasmuch as previous editions have been shown to be extremely defective. Sanchez, in 1779, first published the poem in the free and inaccurate manner of the time. In 1858 Damas Hinard produced the second edition at Paris, basing his text upon that of Sanchez, and carefully

²² Pages 237-247.

²³ Page 245.

²⁴ Page 246.

²⁵ Page 247.

copying most of his errors. Again, for the third time, the Spanish scholar Janer printed the entire poem in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, Tomo 57, 1864. This edition, taken from the manuscript, although a great improvement upon its predecessors, falls far short of modern requirements for a critical text.

Exactly one hundred years after the first edition, namely, in 1879, Vollmöller published his paleographic copy of the manuscript, making no attempt at text-constitution other than to punctuate most superficially.

Since 1879 numerous notes and criticisms upon the poem have appeared in the journals: —*Romania*, *Literaturblatt*, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, and *Il Propugnatore di Bologna*, until almost every obscure or disputed passage has been commented upon by such philologists as Cornu, Baist, Nyrop, Vollmöller and Restori. In the present edition Dr. Lidforss, who unfortunately did not see the manuscript, has selected his text after a careful examination of the foregoing publications, giving, in the space of seventy quarto pages, the variant readings and a large number of collected and original notes.

The introduction contains, besides a Cid-bibliography, a detailed description of the manuscript quoted from Sanchez, as also a review of the various theories respecting the date of both manuscript and poem.

The editor describes two methods heretofore employed by critics of the text; one, word-change, punctuation, etc., in order to harmonize language and meaning; the other, an endeavor, by inversion of word-order, or by addition of a word, to perfect the form of the poem, regulating the length of lines and correcting faults of assonance.

The metrical system of Restori is explained at full length in the latter's own words. The text itself, printed in clear, large type, and with wide margin, presents a most attractive appearance. The verse-numbering corresponds to that of Vollmöller, except where the order of individual lines has been transposed. The numbering of the manuscript-paging has, however, been omitted, although it is frequently of great importance. The text has been

divided into one hundred and three series of assonances, following Restori.

For the first time we here find the poem divided into three parts, each preceded by an appropriate title:

- I. *El Salido de Castilla*, vv. 1-1085,
- II. *Perdon y Gracia*, vv. 1086-2277,
- III. *Las Cortes de Toledo*, vv. 2278-3732.

Over seven hundred verses have received correction from the form in which they were printed by Vollmöller. Of these, nearly one hundred verses are changed merely by the separation of word-combinations, or by the joining of words separated in the codex; for example, v. 2266, Voll. *ca sera*, Lidf. *ca [asi] era*; v. 3386, Voll. *amigo*, Lidf. *[a] amigo*; v. 475, Voll. *preçia nada*, Lidf. *preçia[n] nada*; v. 572, Voll. *males*, Lidf. *mal [l]es*; v. 1312, Voll. *a vn poco ha*, Lidf. *aun poco ha*.

Examples of this class lead Lidforss to believe that the manuscript was dictated, the copyist writing down these contractions which are purely phonetical. This supposition serves also to explain the false division of several verses. More than one hundred verses are corrected by the addition of an omitted letter or by the removal of one superfluous; for example, *to(s)dos*, *f(l)ablar*, *da(n)d*, *ca[m]po*, *coraço[n]*, *Go[n]çalo*.

A large proportion of these errors are omissions of the letter *n*, as the bar sign for *n* was easily forgotten, or was frequently written so lightly as to have been almost unnoticeable. The text is carefully punctuated throughout, the more difficult passages generally in accordance with the ideas of Baist or Cornu.

Verse 597 illustrates the care which has been given to this subject; the expression *Firid los cavalleros* occurs frequently throughout the poem, always written with comma after *los*. Cornu, however, upon investigation, found that the article often preceded the noun in direct address, and that metathesis generally took place when the imperative was immediately followed by its object pronoun, so that this phrase must read *Firid, los cavalleros*, otherwise the form would be *firildos*, corresponding to numerous similar constructions throughout the poem. Lidforss has adopted many corrections of this nature, always nam-

ing his authority and giving a discussion of the matter in the notes.

Changes in the text for the sake of assonance are frequent; for example, v. 1751, *dado*, for *dada*; and even, v. 2571, *mil marcos de oro* for *mil marcos de plata*.

Restori is the authority usually followed here, as also in the subdivision of long verses. The parts of such verses are lettered *a*, *b*, and thus preserve the numbering of the codex.

In regard to the orthography we find initial *r* written *rr* with a few careless exceptions; for example, vv. 10, 1984, *riendas*; v. 825, *ricas*; v. 467, *Rodrigo*. *V* is written for the consonant, *u* for the vowel. The form *fazer* is replaced by *far* when in assonance; cf. vv. 252, 561, 1105, 1213, 1642, 2220, 2865, 3055, 3601, or by *fer* when not in assonance; cf. 2160. The frequent term *yfantes*, we find written with single or with double *f*, generally at variance with the spelling of the codex, while in two cases we have the modern form *infantes*, vv. 1835, 2171.

A want of care is also shown in the omission of the cedilla; cf. vv. 1818, 2753, *Cid*; v. 1996, *Garciaz*, v. 3658, *Gonzalez*; vv. 2008, 2056, *nacio*; v. 1321, *merced*; v. 1583, *rrecibir*; v. 534, *ciento* with *çiento* in the same line.

Beside the typographical errors which have been corrected in the notes there may be mentioned; v. 558, *contra* . . . *contro*, for *contra* . . . *contra*; v. 659, *a de noch*, for *e de noch*; v. 1642, *agenas* omitted; v. 1792, *aquestes* for *aquestas*; v. 3502, *las solto*, for *los solto*; also v. 3271, we note an interrogation mark in place of an exclamation point. Misprints in the notes are frequent.

A most praiseworthy feature of this edition is the frequent use of the *Cronica General de España* (ed. de Zamora, 1541). For examples of verses corrected by a comparison with the *Cronica*, cf. vv. 822-931; *dos mil missas*, for *mil missas*; also v. 2086, *vos las casays*, for *vos las criastes*;

With this exception there is little that is new in the book, nor is any originality claimed by the editor, yet, as a beautifully printed and carefully arranged compend of the best work that has been done upon the *Poema del Cid*, the present edition is invaluable by offering to

the student an opportunity, in the editor's words—"examinarlo todo y retener lo que fuere bueno."

GEORGE G. BROWNELL.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE GASTON PARIS MEDALLION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The *objet d'art* more than a year ago planned to be given to M. Gaston Paris in commemoration of his election to the French Academy, has finally found its place on the mantel of M. Paris' private library. Some twenty-five subscribers who were present in Paris on Friday, July 29, led by M. Emile Picot, professor of Roumanian at the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, gathered on that date at the Collège de France, where they were welcomed, and their gift received, by M. and Mme Paris.

The memorial is not, as it had first been intended, an allegorical figure in some form, but a silver portrait medallion (8 by 10 centimetres in dimension) of the master himself, executed by the well-known engraver Chaplain. The likeness is perfect in every way, and the work is most artistic. M. Paris is represented in profile, and what one finds portrayed here, in contour, eye, forehead, mouth and chin, is what those who have the good fortune to know M. Paris more intimately, constantly see in him—nobility of purpose, energy, affection and kindness. The artist ingeniously lets us see the tip of the monocle that M. Paris wears on his left eye, with the result that we seem to have the last touch requisite to an engaging and perfect realism; so that everyone must feel that the ideal face depicted is that of the real Gaston Paris. The inscriptions are becomingly simple. On the one side "1897" in the left hand corner, and opposite it: *Gaston Paris*. On the reverse side, the following words:

A . Gaston . Paris . Mbre . de . l'Académie . des . Inscriptions . Administrateur . du . Collège . de . France . en . souvenir . de . son .

élection . à . l'Académie . Française . ses . élèves . ses . amis . 28 . mai . 1896.

In the lower right-hand corner is a wreath of laurel and roses.

M. André Beaunier, one of the principal promoters of the idea of this commemoration, and member of M. Paris' present classes at the École des Hautes Etudes, read the following address in the name of all the subscribers:

Cher Maître, cher Ami,

La médaille sur laquelle un éminent artiste a fixé votre image a, dans la pensée de ceux qui vous l'offrent, des significations diverses: pour les uns, c'est un souvenir amical destiné à rappeler une date heureuse; pour les autres, c'est un témoignage de fraternité scientifique; d'autres enfin, étudiants de toute nationalité, jeunes professeurs qui vont porter dans les universités les plus lointaines vos méthodes et vos enseignements, l'adressent comme un pieux hommage de reconnaissance à leur maître vénéré. Mais tous, jeunes ou vieux, sont unis dans un même sentiment d'admiration pour la tâche si belle et si considérable que vous avez remplie et que vous poursuivez encore avec la même persévérance, la même passion ardente et désintéressée pour la vérité. Sans doute, en vous appelant à elle, l'Académie Française a entendu honorer d'une façon plus spéciale l'écrivain, le littérateur à qui l'austérité de la recherche précise n'a jamais fait perdre le sens de la beauté. Mais nous, nous ne distinguons point, de même que la sympathie profonde que nous essayons de vous témoigner ne distingue point l'homme de son œuvre: nous aimons autant que nous admirons. Et c'est de tout cœur que nous vous présentons cette médaille, symbole durable de votre œuvre, en vous souhaitant encore de longues années glorieuses pour la philologie et les lettres françaises.

M. Paris, in very simple but touching terms, testified his appreciation of the gift and made grateful acknowledgment to all who had joined in its bestowment. Together with the medallion, a four-page quarto parchment was presented to M. Paris, containing the address above quoted and the names of all subscribers. Among the more prominent of these may be mentioned: Havet, Joret, Paul Meyer, Morel-Fatio, Psichari, A. Thomas; d'Ancona, Comparetti, Crescini, Novati, Mussafia, Rajna; Cloetta, Meyer-Lübke, Schuchardt, Stengel, Stimming, Suchier, A. Tobler, Vollmöller; Nyrop, Söderhjelm, Storm, Wahlund; and

finally, H. A. Todd, E. W. Manning, T. F. Crane, E. S. Sheldon, A. Marshall Elliott.

WM. MILWITZKY.

Château de Cerisy (Manche).

Yeoman.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In casually looking through a new edition of William Harrison's *Elizabethan England*,¹ I stumbled upon an etymology of the word *Yeoman*. In the chapter "Of degrees of people in the Commonwealth of England" Harrison gives what appears to have been the accepted derivation of the word in England in the Sixteenth Century, and also discusses the social significance of the term at length. Harrison seems here to have anticipated in part the etymology proposed by Stratmann and defended and explained by Baskervill.² I give the two paragraphs in which the term is discussed and explained in their entirety:

"Yeomen are those which by our land are called *Legales homines*, free men born English, and may dispend of their own free land in yearly revenue to the sum of forty shillings sterling, or six pounds as money goeth in our times. Some are of the opinion, by Cap. 2 Rich. 2 Ann. 20, that they are the same which the Frenchmen call varlets, but, as that phrase is used in my time, it is very unlikely to be so. The truth is that the word is derived from the Saxon term *Zeoman* or *Geoman*, which signifieth (as I have read) a settled or staid man, such I mean as being married and of some years, betaketh himself to stay in the place of his abode for the better maintenance of himself and his family, whereof the single sort have no regard, but are likely to be still fleeting now hither now thither, which argueth want of stability in determination and resolution of judgment, for the execution of things of any importance. This sort of people have a certain pre-eminence, and more estimation than labourers and the common sort of artificers, and these commonly live wealthily, keep good houses, and travel to get riches. They are also for the most part farmers to gentlemen (in old time called *Pagani*, et *opponuntur militibus*, and therefore Persius

¹ *Elizabethan England*, with Introduction by F. J. Furnivall, L.L.D. Ed. by Lothrop Withington. The Scott Library, London: Walter Scott. The Introduction is a reprint from Furnivall's edition of the work, New Shakspere Society, 1878.

² MOD. LANG. NOTES, Dec. 1895.

calleth himself *Semipaganus*), or at the leastwise artificers, and with grazing, frequenting of markets, and keeping of servants (not idle servants, as the gentlemen do, but such as get both their own and part of their masters' living), do come to great wealth, insomuch that many of them are able and do buy the lands of unthrifty gentlemen, and often setting their sons to the schools, to the universities, and to the Inns of the Court, or, otherwise leaving them sufficient lands whereupon they may live without labour, do make them by those means to become gentlemen. These were they that in times past made all France afraid. And albeit they be not called 'Masters,' as gentlemen are, or 'Sir,' as to knights appertaineth, but only 'John' and 'Thomas,' etc., yet have they been found to have done very good service."³

"The third and last sort is named the Yeomanry, of whom and their sequel, the labourers and artificers, I have said somewhat even now. Whereto I add that they may not be called *masters* and *gentlemen*, but *goodmen*, as Goodman Smith, Goodman Coot, Goodman Cornell, etc.; and in matters of law these and the like are called thus, *Giles Jewd*, *Yeoman*; *Edward Mountford*, *Yeoman*; *James Cocke*, *Yeoman*, etc.; by which addition they are exempt from the vulgar and common sorts, Cato calleth them *Aratores et optimos cives rei publicæ*, of whom also you may read more in the book of commonwealth, which Sir Thomas Smith some time penned of this land."⁴

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

BALDR.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—While a very strong burden of proof may lie in any attempt to refer the derivation of *Baldr* to a *bal* stem, it seems, sufficiently plausible again to make the effort. Such reference satisfies the demands of signification and form-development. The identification of *Baldr* with Old English *bealdor* may be accidental. In fact the presence of Gothic *balps*, Old English *beald*, etc., would argue for the universal existence of a form in a terminal dental stem. This point may be dependent, however, on the time of the introduction of this god into the Scandinavian and Teutonic cult. Against the Edda form one may oppose, it seems to me, from right of priority, the *Phol* form existing in the second *Merseburger*

Spruch. In this latter we have, perhaps, one of the best preserved documents relating to the heathen gods. Although as Kögel has shown in *Grund*. ii, 162 ff., the relation of *Phol* to *Baldr* is not shown in this *Spruch*, yet, from the imperfect alliteration due to corrupt transmission, it would be safer to argue in favor of than against identification. The presence of epic touches and freedom from Christian cult is a strong plea for the value of the forms found in the *Spruch*. If we are to accept the *Merseburger Spruch* as ostfränkisch despite un-shifted *d*, it would be easy to account for the juxtaposition of *Phol* and *balderes*. As an appellative the latter might exist in a much later introduced form. This in fact seems to be the history of the form. In Old English, save the adj. form *beald*, the word in a wider range seems to have had a tardy use; in l. 2178 of *Beowulf* we find the weak verb *bealdian*; *bealdor* is found in but two places; that is, l. 2568 referring to *Beowulf*; l. 2429 where, in conjunction with *frea-wine*, the older word, it refers to Hrethel. The manifold use of the *frea* forms in the *Beowulf* and its gradual substitution by the *beald* forms would argue for a much later introduction of the latter into the *Beowulf*, say at some subsequent re-working.

The *Baldr* myth is late; it does not seem to have spread beyond Scandinavia, despite the high position of the god. Traces of the myth are greatest in Denmark and Norway. After him the May-weed is called *Balders-brae*, typical of the brilliant white light of the sun; he is called the whitest of the *Asen*; he stands refulgent in the dazzling splendor of the source of day; he overlooks the world in his gleaming castle, *Breidablik*. In fact, *Baldr* is the sun god in the newer order that went down before the Christian cult in Scandinavia. In him, as in his genetic and friendly relations, we see the symbol of the mild and beneficent influence of the sun. In this respect, *Baldr* seems to bear to *Vali* and *Volla* the same relationship as does *Frija* (*Frigg*) to *Freyr*, slight shadings, gender types merely, of the same idea under personification.

The hypostatic nature of divinity in the Teutonic and Scandinavian gods makes it exceedingly difficult for exact identification.

³ *Eliz. Engl.*, pp. 11-13.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 16.

The relations they bear to one another often vary within the same cult; and this becomes still more diverse, even to assumption of opposite qualities, when early Teutonic is compared with late Scandinavian. However, in all forms of *Ziu* or *Tyr* to *Baldr*, or in *Frija*, *Frigg*, *Freyr*, the idea symbolized is that of the sun, the bright light of heaven.

In *Sks. bhalas*, Gr. *φαλος*, lustre, white light, we have the cognates with Old English *bæl*, Kelt. *bal*, Icel. *bal*, a great fire or funeral pyre; the latter meaning is secondary. In *Beowulf*, 2309, 2323, *bæl* signifies the deadly white heat of the dragon's flames. The word occurs in *Beowulf*, in two other line groups and refers to the burning of *Hnäf* and *Beowulf*. The word exists in modern English *bald*, *ballard*, etc. When Chaucer wrote l. 198 of *Gen. Prol.* to *C. T.* 'His heed was ballid and schon as eny glas,' the word is used with quite the same force as when we speak of a bald knob, or as seen in *Björnsen's Synnøve Solbakken*. The popular German phrase, '*er hat Mondschein auf dem Kopf*' bears the meaning of *bal* to bald even though transferred to a lesser luminary.

If we ascribe late origin to the nomen *Baldr*, as appellative of the sun god, to which all things seem to tend, it can then be easily referred to the *ball* stem. By a principle of substitution we frequently find within Scandinavian dialects *ld* for *ll* and vice-versa. Metathesis and gemination of *lp* forms cannot be at work since we should have had a double dental.

The *Laxdæla saga* may show, in the Gudrun-Bolli pair, a development of both myth and form changed, however, to suit other ethical conditions.

Further speculation would be idle. I close the note with the firm belief that, in so far as there may be continuity to the transmission, we must endeavor to find the central idea under personification. To the gods were given names characteristic of their purpose. The idea of boldness does not fit, above all, that of god *Baldr*. He is typical of the white mark in heaven, the god beneficent to all nature, and at whose death all nature weeps.

GLEN LEVIN SWIGGETT.

Purdue University.

Gray AND Grey.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In *A Descriptive Handbook of Modern Water Colours*, by J. Scott Taylor, B. A. Camb. London: Winsor and Newton, 1887, neutral tint is described as

"A compound shadow colour of a cool neutral character. It is not very permanent, as the gray is apt to become grey by exposure"

Has any one besides this author ever made a distinction of meaning between *gray* and *grey*? I do not know how the distinction is to be conveyed in speaking unless the words are differently pronounced.

ANDREW INGRAHAM.

The Swain Free School.

VALENTINE OR VILENTYNE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In the Early Scottish poem *The Howlat*, we are told how the Owl, after he had been decked in borrowed plumage, began to behave with insufferable arrogance to the other birds; and, among other things:

"Thus wycit he the Walentyne, thraly and thrawin—"

that is: "thus managed (or ruled) he the valentine, violently and angrily." St. Valentine's day being considered the pairingtime of birds, the obvious meaning would be that he undertook to control the business of the pairing-time in a high-handed manner.

But in the romance of *Sir Ferumbras* (l. 3555) we are told that the Emir Balan goes hawking to a river-side, where

"... vilentyne he fond ynow."

Here *vilentyne* means wild-fowl or birds, and represents the "*oisiaux et volatisses*" of the French original.

The object of this note is to ask if there be other instances of *valentine* or *vilentyne* used in the sense of birds collectively.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

DULCINEA AND THE DICTIONARIES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The name of Don Quixote's Dulcinea, has long been of not uncommon use in English literature as a general term for a sweetheart; yet the dictionary-makers have given the word scant recognition. Only in the latest dictionaries does it appear at all. The *Standard Dictionary* and the *Century Dictionary of Names* both give it, but without citing any authorities. The *International* quotes the well-known passage from one of Sterne's letters (1765): "I myself must ever have some Dulcinea in my head." Murray's *New English Dictionary* quotes four examples; the earliest is from Smollett's *Roderick Random* (1748): "His dulcinea . . . persuaded him." Yet over a hundred years before an English author of repute had used the word. It is to be found in the fifth edition (1638) of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, page 518, in the chapter on "Symptoms of Love," (part iii, sect. ii, memb. 3, subsect. 1):

"'Tis not Venus picture that, nor the Spanish Infanta's, as you suppose, (good Sir) no Princesse, or Kings daughter; no no but his divine mistress forsooth, his dainty *Dulcinia*, his deare Antiphila, to whose service he is wholly consecrate, whom hee alone adores."

The passage is of especial interest, because the words "his dainty Dulcinia" have been introduced since the previous edition of 1632, where (p. 526) the reading is "his divine mistress forsooth, his deare Antiphila." It would seem that in the half-dozen years between these editions Burton had become acquainted with the word *Dulcinea*. Skelton's translation of Don Quixote had appeared as early as 1612, but of course it is possible that Burton had not read it until this period, and thus introduced the word directly into English literature. Or perhaps he has merely borrowed it from some contemporary whose use of it still remains unrecorded. According to the index to Shilleto's edition of the *Anatomy*, Burton never cites or refers to Cervantes. The modern editions, which usually follow the sixth folio, do not indicate this, or any of the numerous changes that Burton was constantly making in his great work.

The French lexicographers, as might be expected, have paid greater attention to their dulcineas. Larousse, in particular, has a long article on the word. The earliest of his many citations is from De Bernis, who wrote in the latter half of the eighteenth century. If the word has crept into the German language, it is not recognized in Grimm's *Wörterbuch*.

ALFRED CLAGHORN POTTER.

Harvard College.

BRIEF MENTION.

"Pars est prima prudentiæ, ipsam cui præcepturus sis, æstimare personam," is a maxim applicable to other manuals than those *De Re Rustica*. A handbook of English literature¹ is not meant for the mature scholar, but for the tiro, to give him a distinct outline-map of the regions which he will later explore. Hence the writer, while he must necessarily omit much, should endeavor to preserve such points as will peg themselves into the reader's memory. The criticisms, if brief, should be sound and suggestive: and the writer, keeping in mind that he is writing for beginners, should avoid allusions which presuppose familiarity with the subject.

As an instance of insufficiency and unimpressiveness in the book before us, we may refer to the seven lines devoted to Donne. There could hardly be more unsound and unsuggestive criticism than the statement that Jonson's noble and powerful tragedies "can claim no loftier praise than that of being excellent mosaic." The art of stating facts without conveying information is well illustrated by the five lines devoted to Vanbrugh:—"The satire of Swift still clings to the architectural remains of Sir John Vanbrugh (1666-1726) in Blenheim and Castle Howard; but the *Relapse*" [and other dramas named] "still attest his wit as well as his immorality."

The book is printed in a type so minute and trying to the eyes, that we should hesitate to recommend it as a text-book, even were it otherwise the best of its kind.

¹ *A Handbook of English Literature*, originally compiled by AUSTIN DOBSON. New Edition by W. Hall Griffin, B. A. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1897.